# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. WITHOUT CONCEALMENT....WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 22. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1852. WHOLE NO. 646.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.


## Selections.

### DEBATE IN THE SENATE ON THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

[Concluded from Standard of October 7.]

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I did not intend to have said anything, and I shall now occupy the attention of the Senate but a very few moments. But I feel that I should be doing injustice to my own feelings, and injustice to my friend, the senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Sumner], who has addressed the Senate to-day, if I were to fail at this time to express the very great gratification with which I listened to his speech. In saying that, I do not mean to pass by entirely the honourable senator from North Carolina [Mr. Badger], for I listened to him, as I always do, with great pleasure; but justice compels me to say that I thought that by far the best part of his speech were the extracts which he read from a former speech of the honourable senator from Massachusetts [laughter]. I listened to them both with great pleasure; but, sir, I feel bound to say to-day that it is my deliberate conviction that the honourable senator from Massachusetts, if he were actuated by as corrupt and selfish motives as could possibly be attributed to him, has, so far as his own personal fame and reputation are concerned, done enough by the effort he has made here to-day to place himself side by side with the first orators of antiquity, and as far ahead of any living American orator as Slavery is ahead of Freedom [great laughter]. It was a slip of the tongue, Mr. President, but too true under the administration of this government. It is but too true when applied to the politics of this country—literally true. But, for the purpose of doing justice to my own feelings, I will now say what, but for a slip of the tongue, I would have said before—as Freedom is ahead of Slavery. I believe that he has formed to-day a new era in the history of the politics and of the eloquence of the country, and that in future generations the young men of this nation will be stimulated to effort by the record of what an American senator has this day done, to which all the appeals drawn from ancient history would be entirely inadequate. Yes, sir, he has to-day made a draught upon the gratitude of the friends of humanity and of liberty that will not be paid through many generations, and the memory of which shall endure as long as the English language is spoken, or the history of this republic forms a part of the annals of the world. That, sir, is what I believe; and if I had one other feeling or could indulge it in reference to that effort, it would be a feeling of envy that it was not in me to tread even at an humble distance in the path which he has so nobly and eloquently illustrated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I will not protract this debate. I have no comments to make upon the speeches which have been made. The arguments against the fugitive slave law, when examined closely, are arguments against the constitution of our country, and not against the provisions of the law which has been passed for the purpose of carrying that constitution into effect. All that is said about the crime of Slavery—about a law higher than the constitution, which forbids obedience to human laws in conflict with the divine law—the whole tenour of the objections that have been urged are objections against the constitution rather than against the law. What would these gentlemen care for the form of proceedings and provisions of the law, provided the fugitive was not to be returned to his master? The real objection is that the fugitive is sent back, not that the form of trial does not satisfy them. I repeat that the real objection that is made in the country everywhere is that the fugitive is sent back to his master, there to be tried whether he is a fugitive or not by the laws of the State from which he fled. That being the true character of the objection, it is an objection against the constitution itself and gentlemen should make a real issue, should pass over the law and make their assaults directly against the constitution of the United States, in obedience to which the law was passed. Let them take the responsibility of an open and manly avowal of their real position. Let them proclaim to the world that they feel bound by conscientious scruples to make violent resistance to the constitution which our fathers have transmitted to us. Such is their evident meaning. All I have to say on that subject is this, that the constitution provides that a fugitive from service in one State, escaping into another, "shall be delivered up." The constitution also provides that no man shall be a senator unless he takes an oath to support the constitution. Then, I ask, how does a man acquire a right on this floor to speak, except by taking an oath to support and sustain the constitution of the United States? And when he takes that oath, I do not understand that he has a right to have a mental reservation, or entertain any secret equivocation that he expects that clause which relates to the surrender of fugitives from service. I know not how a man reconciles it to his conscience to take that oath to support the constitution when he believes that constitution is in violation of the law of God. If a man thus believes and takes the oath, he commits perfidy to his God in order that he may enjoy the temporary honours of a seat upon this floor. In this point of view, it is simply a question of whether senators will be true to their oaths and true to the constitution under which we live.

Sir, whenever I come to the conclusion that I cannot conscientiously perform my obligations under that instrument which I am sworn to support, you will find me refusing to take office under this government, and, at the same time, declaring myself for instant disunion, in order to release myself from any obligation which I cannot conscientiously carry into effect. But, sir, so long as I am content to live under the constitution, I will be faithful to all its provisions. I know of no other mode—I know of no other alternative, except to observe the constitution, and the oath to support, in its letter and its spirit. He who cannot do this has no right to hold office under this government, or under the State governments, while the constitution exists; for the constitution of the United States requires all officers under the State governments to take an oath of allegiance to the constitution of the United States. Hence you cannot have a judge in any State, or a member of the Legislature, or any other officer, who has not taken an oath to support the constitution of the United States, and thereby promised that every fugitive from service shall be delivered up.

How is it, then, that we are told that men with these obligations resting upon them, who have appealed to God for the sincerity of their vow to carry into effect the constitution in all its parts, proclaiming that it is their duty, under an obligation to conscience, to violate both the constitution and their oath, in order to avert what they believe an evil or a crime?

These are my opinions upon this subject, and hence I shall vote against the proposition to repeal the fugitive slave law, and for whatever appropriations are necessary to carry it into effect, believing that it is my solemn duty, as it is my cheerful pleasure, to carry into effect every provision of the constitution of the United States.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. President, I certainly do not desire to weary the Senate, at this late hour, by attempting to discuss the question which has been obtruded upon it to-day. But I may be allowed briefly to express my opinion upon this question, as I am now, for the first time, called on to vote upon it in the Senate.

I will say, sir, at the outset, that this is the first time in the course of my life that I have listened to the whole of an Abolition speech. I did not know that it was possible that I could endure a speech for over three hours upon the subject of the abolition of Slavery. But this oration of the senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Sumner] to-day has been so handsomely embellished with poetry, both Latin and English, so full of classical allusions and rhetorical flourishes, as to make it much more palatable than I supposed it could have been made. I do not see what object the senator from Massachusetts could have had in view, unless it was to excite in the free States of this Union a forcible resistance to the enactment of the last Congress known as "the fugitive slave law." In the exercise of that power which is vested in you under the constitution, you have attempted to give security to one of the institutions that exist in a portion of the States of this confederacy. Does any man suppose that this Union can be maintained unless every section of it is secured in the undisputed enjoyment of its constitutional rights? Can the Union be maintained if one portion of the confederacy is permitted to trample upon the rights of another? I apprehend it is too late in the day to discuss the constitutionality of the fugitive law. The power of Congress to legislate on the subject is, in my opinion, unquestionable. The former law of 1793, containing provisions similar to those found in this, was passed by the fathers of the republic, who understood, perhaps, the constitution quite as well as the senator from Massachusetts.

Sir, I look to no "higher law" than the constitution of the United States in ascertaining the political rights of the members of this confederacy. I find that here is an institution fastened upon this country, recognised by the constitution, and I am willing to throw around it all the guarantees necessary to give it protection. Now, that Congress, in the exercise of the power conferred by the constitution, have legislated, and the public mind has become settled down, and there is a peaceable and quiet execution of the law in almost every section of the Union, the senator from Massachusetts, by an inflammatory speech, indirectly, at least, counsels forcible resistance. Why this attempt to show the resemblance between the fugitive slave law and the stamp act, which our revolutionary fathers resisted? The stamp act was resisted by revolution, by bloodshed.

Mr. SUMNER. The stamp act was not resisted forcibly.

Mr. WELLER. It was one of the acts which brought about the revolution, which did result in bloodshed. It was one of the acts which our fathers refused to execute. And is the senator from Massachusetts prepared for this? Does he counsel the people of Massachusetts, as he has to-day, to resist the execution of the law? Does he not know that, if his counsel is taken, bloodshed is inevitable? Sir, I would rather be the lowest and humblest slave in all the land than to have the blood of murdered men upon my hands. If the constituents of the senator from Massachusetts follow his direction, if they obey his counsels, murder, I repeat, is inevitable; and upon your hands, sir—ay, upon your hands [addressing Mr. Sumner]—must rest the blood of those murdered men. Are you prepared for that? Would your conscience sustain you in this? This forcible resistance is not only calculated to strike at the foundation of our republican institutions by dissolving the Union, but to bring upon the head of the learned senator from Massachusetts the blood of murdered men. He who counsels murder is himself a murderer! Does he think that any officer, who is charged with the execution of the law of the land, will not execute it? Does he not know that force will be met by force? Does he approve of the murders of Christiana? Would a repetition of that horrible tragedy gratify his taste?

The senator from Massachusetts has denounced the slave-hunter as if he were a monster of most hideous mien! Who is the "slave-hunter?" A man who resides in one of the States of this Union in the possession of certain property—property around which the guarantees of legislation have been thrown. The property escapes into a free State, and the owner pursues it. He goes, then, under the law of Congress, for the purpose of recovering that which is regarded as property; and the senator counsels the good people of Massachusetts to regard that law as similar to the stamp act, and to resort to revolution in order to resist it! Does the senator fully comprehend and properly appreciate the responsibility resting upon him?

Mr. SUMNER. Allow me to correct the senator. I run a parallel between the slave act and the stamp act; and in doing that, I showed historically how our fathers opposed the stamp act, and my language was precisely this: That they rallied the country in peaceful phalanx against the execution of the act; that, within the bounds of the law and the constitution, to that object they dedicated the patriot energies of the land. Such was the language I employed, as near as I can recollect; and let me say, that not one word has fallen from my lips to-day suggesting, in any way, a resort to force.

Mr. WELLER. Then, I entirely misunderstood the character of his speech, and the whole tenour of his oration.

Mr. SUMNER. Most certainly you did.

Mr. WELLER. Then, I must plead guilty to the humiliating charge of not being able to comprehend the English language. My friend from North Carolina [Mr. Badger] read extracts from a speech of the senator from Massachusetts, delivered before he came here, in which, while he seems to have said ironically, "I do not counsel you to resistance," uses language calculated to lead directly to the forcible resistance of the law. If that is not to be inferred from his speech to-day—if any other construction can be fairly placed upon it—then I am unable to understand the force of English words. If, as he affirms, this act of Congress is a violation of the law of God, of the constitution of the United States, "a wicked, infamous, devilish law, abhorrent to every principle of religion and morality," then a forcible resistance would be justifiable.

So that the senator cannot escape from the conclusion. But, Mr. President, I hold that it is not only your duty to throw around this institution of Slavery all the guarantees which legislation demands, in accordance with the power given by the constitution, but you are bound as good citizens to avoid all agitation of that question in the free States. You are bound to prevent, as far as possible, any state of feeling from being engendered calculated to prevent a just and fair execution of the law. You are under a solemn obligation as citizens of the republic to abstain from pursuing any course in the free States which is calculated to defeat the recovery of the property which may escape from the owner. You do not legislate upon the subject, it is true. You pass no law in Massachusetts prohibiting the slave-owner from going there in pursuit of his property; and why? Because you know that the Supreme Court of the United States would declare that all that sort of legislation was unconstitutional and void. But you do more; you manufacture by the sort of speeches we have heard here to-day a state of public feeling which more effectually shuts out the slaveholder than any legislation you could adopt. Is that good faith amongst men and amongst States, all confederated together in one common Union? Does not common honesty require that we shall pursue that course toward each other which is calculated to preserve the peace and quiet of the whole?

But, Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss this subject; I only rose to express briefly my opinions, and to give utterance to the feelings of my heart. Perhaps it was not necessary that I should have expressed them—certainly not with regard to those gentleman with whom I have been associated in public life, and to whom I am personally known. My opinions upon the subject have been well understood by them. I avowed them in 1848, when I had the high satisfaction of being beaten for Governor in the State of Ohio. Upon the Western Reserve, the hot-bed of Abolitionism—that section of my State where the sentiments avowed by the senator from Massachusetts will be appreciated—there I told his Abolition friends that if I were elected by two votes, and ascertained that two Abolitionists had voted for me, I would resign the office and go home. You may infer from that, sir, what my sentiments have been toward the Abolitionists. And now, sir, let me say, in *conclusion*, that I am content with the constitution as it is. It has made us a great and prosperous nation—a happy and free people—contented at home and respected abroad. I desire to devote all the energies of my soul to its perpetuity; but I cannot see how it can be perpetuated except by securing to each State the undisturbed enjoyment of its constitutional rights.

Mr. CHASE. Mr. President, the senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] has made a very serious charge against all those who propose to vote for the amendment of the senator from Massachusetts. He has charged us with infidelity—deliberate and purposed infidelity—to the constitution we have sworn to support.

Sir, I repel the charge. I deny it in its letter and in its spirit—in its whole breadth and in all its detail. The argument which my friend from Massachusetts has addressed to us to-day was not an assault upon the constitution. It was a noble vindication of that great charter of government from the perversions of the advocates of the fugitive slave act.

Why, sir, what is the very first proposition which the advocates of that act are bound to maintain? Is it not this—that the power to enact it has been granted in the constitution to Congress? And what has the senator from Massachusetts asserted? That the fugitive servant clause of the constitution is a clause of compact between the States, and confers no legislative power upon Congress. He has arrayed history and reason in support of this proposition; and I avow my conviction, now and here, that, logically and historically, his argument is impregnable—entirely impregnable.

Now, sir, before gentlemen undertake to charge us with treason, let them answer the argument of the senator from Massachusetts. Until they do that, let them understand that the supporters of the fugitive law are quite as obnoxious to the charge as its opponents.

Something has been said in censure of the senator for having spoken at all on this subject to-day. We are told that the session approaches its close, and that business presses. I do not undertake to interpret the senator's motives, but I know, and you know, that weeks ago he asked the Senate to consider a resolution which he had laid upon your table that he might have an opportunity of submitting the views which he has now delivered with so much eloquence and power. Then, sir, we were not pressed with business. Then we adjourned over Saturdays. And yet the Senate, upon the yeas and nays, refused his request. During the three sessions I have occupied a seat in this chamber, I never before knew the courtesy of a hearing refused to a senator under similar circumstances.

The PRESIDENT. I think the honourable senator is mistaken.

Mr. CHASE. The Chair corrects me. I only state my own recollection. If there is an instance of such refusal I should be glad to hear it named. Certainly, within the last few days, when the senator from New York expressed a wish to be heard on the resolution relating to the fisheries, and some indisposition was manifested to the postponement of the debate for his convenience, more than one gentleman remarked, that to give a senator a hearing on a subject on which he deemed it his duty to address the Senate was a courtesy never refused here.

Well, sir, when the senator from Massachusetts was thus refused a hearing, what opinion was left to him? His sense of public duty and personal obligation required him to declare his views on the great subject he had discussed before the close of this session. You denied him a convenient opportunity. That denial compelled him to avail himself of an inconvenient opportunity. You refused an ordinary courtesy of the Senate; that refusal constrained him to avail himself of his right as a senator. I rejoice that he has done so. The country will hear and judge. Let those who condemn the speech answer its logic and falsify its history, if they can.

While I do not pretend to interpret the motives of the senator, there is one consideration which, I can readily imagine, may have had no little weight with him. His speech will be received as an emphatic protest against the slavish doctrine of finality in legislation which two of the political conventions recently held have joined in forcing upon the country. It is a novel doctrine in this country, that an act of Congress, not in itself a contract, is incapable of repeal or essential modification. It is utterly repugnant to the principles of the Democratic faith and to the spirit of the American people. No act of Congress, with the exception I just named, is irrepealable. No act of Congress is beyond the judgment and the reach of the people, who make Representatives, and Senators, and Presidents.

This attempt to exalt the fugitive slave act above the people will prove abortive. I do not know when the hour for its repeal will arrive; but you may rely upon it it will come. I believe, indeed, that the time is not very far distant when the people of this country will become satisfied that Congress has no power to legislate on this subject; and, while recognising and fulfilling in its whole extent every obligation which the constitution really imposes, will sweep this law from the statute-book as a usurpation of undelegated power.

Let me add, Mr. President, that in my judgment the speech of my friend from Massachusetts will mark AN ERA in American history. It will distinguish the day when the advocates of that theory of governmental policy, constitutional construction, which he has so ably defended and so brilliantly illustrated, no longer content to stand on the defensive in the contest with Slavery, boldly attacked the very citadel of its power in that doctrine of finality, which two of the political parties of the country, through their national organizations, are endeavouring to establish as the impregnable defence of its usurpations.

Let me say further—and I will no longer trespass upon the indulgence of the Senate—that, in my judgment, the country will only find repose from the Slavery agitation when Congress shall cease to legislate on the subject of Slavery.

Mr. DOWNS. All that we want now is peace.

Mr. CHASE. May you have it, and that speedily. But allow me to say that there can be no peace until the Congress of the United States, returning to the original policy of the founders of the republic, and disclaiming all jurisdiction over the subject of Slavery, shall maintain freedom wherever the national jurisdiction is exclusive, and leave the whole subject of Slavery and the extradition of slaves to the States, to be disposed of according to their own sense of justice, of good faith, and of sound policy. Then the question of Slavery will be withdrawn from these halls, and will cease to vex our councils and embarrass our legislation. Then the government of the Union, confining its regards to those great matters of foreign and domestic policy which the constitution has confided to it, will cease to encroach upon the rights of the States and the liberties of individuals. Then we shall have peace. Then, indeed, agitation will subside, and harmony will be restored. I look for that time. I believe it will come, and I know of no object worthier of the best efforts of patriots, or to which I am more willing to devote mine, than that of hastening its coming.

Mr. RUSK. Mr. President, we have four days more of this session remaining. Six hours we have occupied to-day, and none of the appropriation bills are yet passed. Six hours of this day have been occupied by making speeches upon a subject that no man in the Senate will pretend to say will change a single vote upon the matter. The Senate of the United States, therefore, which is pressed with business of vast importance, and much of it of an important character I have in my desk, which must necessarily be unattended to in consequence of the pressure of time, has been used as a sort of stump from which to address the community on a very agitating question. I hope, and trust, and pray, that it may now cease, and that we may come to voting; for I do not believe if we sit here for six months, and make these rhetorical flourishes, these appeals to ancient history, and these quotations of poetry and Latin, that they will operate upon a single senator.

Mr. TOUCEY. Mr. President, I shall certainly not enter into a debate at this late period of the session upon a subject which would require a very extended examination. As, however, I am called upon, for the first time, to record my vote with reference to the fugitive law, I will express, in a very few words, the position which I occupy.

Sir, the constitution declares, in so many words, that a fugitive held to labour in one State, escaping into another, "shall be delivered up." Another clause in the constitution declares that Congress shall have power "to enact all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers," which had been enumerated, "and *all other powers* vested by this constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." Now, sir, this provision in the constitution that fugitive slaves "shall be delivered up," is the supreme law of the land. No law can be made in any State of this Union in conflict with it, and all laws that are necessary to carry that provision into effect may, by the express grant of the constitution, be enacted by Congress. In pursuance, therefore, of the letter of the constitution—of the most unequivocal provision of the constitution—a law was passed in the year 1793, and that law, in every point now in controversy, has been adjudged by the Supreme Court of the United States to be constitutional and valid. The law of the last Congress contains no power that is not embraced in the law of 1793; and I feel justified in saying, in my place here, that the supreme judicial tribunal of this country would unanimously declare this law, as they have declared the former law, to be strictly constitutional. I profess to have some knowledge of the opinion of the legal profession throughout this country, and I venture to affirm that it is the universal opinion of that profession—I do not mean absolutely universal—but with scarcely an exception—without an exception worthy of note—that this law is constitutional, and in strict pursuance of the provision to which I have referred.

Now, sir, the idea has been put forth by the senator from Massachusetts that there is a higher law than the constitution; that a citizen may set up his own private judgment in opposition to the express letter of the constitution—in opposition to the decisions of the Supreme Court and declare a law to be unconstitutional and to be void, and he presses upon the people of this country, by argument, doctrines that lead inevitably to the resistance of the law, to direct, open, forcible resistance. Can there be any attentively to the speech of the honourable senator from Massachusetts, and, if I was able to understand him, the principal object of that speech was to assail the existence of Slavery in the States, and to denounce the requirement that those who were held to service, and had fled into another State, should be delivered up under the provision of the constitution. I say that all the topics that are urged upon the country, tending to create dissatisfaction with this law are based fundamentally upon the idea that slaves ought not to be returned, and that the constitution ought in that respect to be altered; that the letter, the spirit, the meaning of the constitution, and the constitution itself, should be repudiated. I therefore regard this whole agitation as an agitation against the constitution.

Nothing will satisfy those who have expressed opposition to the fugitive law but the repeal of the constitution. And we know that if they could carry out their measures the result would inevitably be a dissolution of this Union and a breaking up of this government. Upon my responsibility as a member of this Senate, I say that the people of the North are not prepared for any such step as this. I say that they are not prepared to enjoy all the benefits of the constitution, and of the compromises of the constitution, and yet refuse on their part to carry out, in good faith, a provision that was meant for the benefit of the southern portion of the country. No, sir; we know that we derive immense benefits; we know that the people of the North are benefitted, perhaps beyond those of any other portion of the country, by the compromises of the constitution. I will not enter into a specification of those benefits; but I say that, while we enjoy them—while we have prospered and grown under them to our present opulence and power—we are not prepared to break our faith with the other States of the confederacy. No, sir; we go—the people of the North go—for the faithful execution of the fugitive law; to carry out the provision of the constitution in good faith, honestly, not evasively; not keeping the promise to the ear, and breaking it to the hope. The public sentiment at the North is for honest, true, faithful execution of the constitution and the compacts of the constitution. I think that there is no public opinion there—I deny that there is any, beyond a very limited circle—that is opposed to the good faith of the constitution and the execution of its provisions. I speak what I know; and the greater the discussion—the greater the agitation—the more universal that opinion will be.

If the doctrines broached by the senator from Massachusetts be true, I do not see why he should stop at avoiding the execution of the fugitive law—a law of Congress carrying out one of the clearest and plainest provisions of the constitution. The very reasons upon which that opposition is founded would justify taking up arms, invading the South, and setting their slaves at liberty. Are they prepared for that? Sir, I say, as I have said before, that the popular sentiment of the North is right on this subject. I do not mean in every locality. I do not mean every individual; but I say that the sound public sentiment of the North upon this subject is right, with the exception of a very limited class.

I did not intend to say as much as I have said, nor, indeed, to say anything on this subject; but I could not give a vote on a measure of this kind without stating the position which I occupied in relation to it, and without stating my entire approbation of the law of Congress, of the compromises of the last Congress, and the importance of carrying them out in good faith. I am happy to say that the country will do it. I am happy to say that the time has gone by when any substantial evil can be done by opposition to these compromises—the compromises of the constitution, or of the last Congress.

I had hoped that the agitation here had ceased; that the subject would not be introduced again. No one supposes that by the introduction of it any legislation will be effected. It is introduced here for other purposes, and the principal purpose, which lies at the formation of every objection, is that which I have already stated. It is, that this plain and explicit provision of the constitution could not be carried out; but that object is one which will never be accomplished while this government shall continue to exist.

Mr. SUMNER. The senator will allow me to ask him a question. If I understand him rightly, he said that this subject was introduced by me. I deprecate no criticism on this account, but I would ask him if it was not primarily introduced by the Committee on Finance of this body in its amendment to this bill?

Mr. TOUCEY. I answer the honourable senator from Massachusetts, with all courtesy, no, sir, it was not.

Mr. BRADBURY. Will the honourable senator from Connecticut allow me to ask the honourable senator from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. TOUCEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would ask the senator from Massachusetts, as he proposed that Congress should repeal the law for the return of fugitive slaves, and therefore for carrying out the provision of the constitution, whether he believes the State which he so ably represents would pass a law which should effectually return the fugitive slave according to the constitution? Would the honourable senator aid in the passage of such a law?

Messrs. WELLER and BUTLER. That is a good question.

Mr. SUMNER. I leave Massachusetts to answer that question [laughter]. At the proper moment she will be heard.

Mr. TOUCEY. I will answer the interrogatory put to me by the senator from Massachusetts. The amendment of the Committee on Finance now under consideration provides merely for the payment of the legal expenses incurred in the execution of the laws; but the senator from Massachusetts has moved an amendment proposing to repeal a law that is not involved in the question of these expenses. He has denounced the validity of that law, and has gone into an argument to prove that Slavery ought to be abolished; and the whole foundation of his argument is not so much that the law itself ought to be repealed for any intrinsic reasons as that the object of the constitution, in his judgment, ought not to be carried out. And he has gone into the subject not, I apprehend, under the expectation that any legislation would take place, but for purposes other than that. What those purposes are I need not mention.

I said, sir, that I had hoped that this subject would not be introduced here. I think I can say, with truth, that the people of this country desire a cessation of this agitation. The people rejoice that this topic has been disposed of. And the introduction of it here again I regard as a great public calamity. But, sir, I do not intend to go into the subject. I shall vote, of course, as every senator knows, against the amendment of the honourable senator from Massachusetts, for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. BRADBURY. Mr. President, I believe that while we live under the constitution, and enjoy the benefits of its provisions, we should live up to its requirements. One of these requirements is, that "no person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, *but shall be delivered up* on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due." Some law is necessary to carry out this provision. Such law must be enacted either by Congress or the States.

The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the duty devolves on Congress. The honourable senator from Massachusetts denies the power of Congress to pass any law for this purpose, and contends it should be left to the States alone. I ask the honourable senator whether he believed that the State which he represents would enact any law that would fully and effectually carry out this provision for the rendition of fugitives, and whether he would aid in the passage of such a law. The honourable senator replied, "Massachusetts must answer for herself." He had not the confidence in her action to say that his State would pass any such law. The honourable senator assuredly ought to know what is the sentiment of the State which he represents. He feels no confidence. It comes then to this: that if we adopt his theory, denying the power of Congress, and repudiating the decisions of the Supreme Court; if we repeal the existing law, and leave it to States which refuse to act, the *practical effect* is, to nullify an express stipulation of the constitution itself. There can be no other conclusion. We leave that to be done by States which they will not do, wherever the senator's sentiments prevail. Let us come, then, to the *substance* and *effect* of the honourable senator's proposition. It is to render an express stipulation of the constitution nugatory. The true question then is, whether we will repudiate and abandon the constitution and the Union, with all its countless blessings, or stand up to the requirements of the compact upon which our government rests.

I repeat, again, sir, that while I live under the constitution, I will live up to its requirements.

Mr. HUNTER. I rise to ask the Senate to allow me to take a vote upon this question. Unless we take a vote upon the amendments to-night, we will lose them all.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, all legislative enactments, except those which imbody within themselves special provisions for their own limitation, are of course open to future action, either in the way of modification or repeal, by the same power which gave them being. But there are many acts, however, which, either to repeal or to modify, would be palpably unjust; and which cases, legislative action to that effect would stand directly opposed to moral right. To repeal or modify a law under such circumstances would be an act equally arbitrary and unjust as to violate a solemn contract. In this same light, I should look on the repeal or modification of those acts usually denominated the compromise acts, including the law for the rendition of fugitive slaves. These acts were passed as acts of concession and conciliation, at a period when agitation and excitement had shaken the Union to its very centre, and thren eed to burst asunder the bands that bind together these States in their federal compact. These acts, the fruit of mutual concessions between the North and the South, were framed and passed in good faith, to settle the policy of the government in respect to the matters to which they refer; to produce public tranquility; to relieve the fears and apprehensions of the people; to protect what our constitution and laws recognise as property, in the hands of its legal owners, and to preserve inviolate the Union of the States.

All friends of the Union—all citizens interested in the settlement of the questions which then agitated the country to such an alarming extent—and they constituted then, as they do now, a vast majority of our citizens—had then the right, as they have it now, to consider those questions settled by the Compromise, and settled forever, or at least until those most deeply interested might consider those laws no longer necessary, and mutually and voluntarily assent to their repeal. Unless such was the intention of these laws, they were deceptive, and the act of passing them hypocritical. But if enacted, as I verily believe, in good faith, with a view to the future, and as a radical cure for the evil to which they were applied, the friends of the Union in every section of our widely-extended country have the right to demand their perpetuity and faithful execution, without repeal and without modification by the Government.

But it is the act for the rendition of fugitive slaves that constitutes the subject of agitation. It is this that disorganizers and advocates of the higher law have fixed upon as the special object of settled hostility; and it is this law they have determined, by all means, fair or foul, to resist, and finally to overthrow, in violation of constitutional obligations and the constitutional rights of the South. Sir, when a body of men discard the constitution of our country, and trample it under their feet because it does not happen in certain provisions to square with their notions—when men, warned beforehand, still bend all their energies to produce a state of things which must, should they succeed, end in anarchy and civil war—when fanatics trample the sacred Scriptures in the dust, because those Scriptures do not inculcate the one idea of fanaticism, and denounce and anathematize all the world calls good and holy—I say, sir, when these men so far forget themselves, and their obligations to their country and their God, as to commit such acts, it is but of little use to attempt to argue with them. I, therefore, speak only for myself to this honourable body, and through this to my fellow-citizens, who recognise their obligations as men and as citizens to the constitution and the laws—to God and their country.

I consider the Constitution of the United States as my political oracle, and deem that it should be so considered by every American citizen. There may be provisions in the time-honoured instrument which might be modified with advantage, and possibly dispensed with altogether. But it is the palladium of our rights. Framed by as wise and patriotic body of men as ever adorned this or any country, and the fruits of long and mature deliberation, in the midst of numerous conflicting interests, it embodies all that is necessary for our rule of government, and to provide for the prosperity and happiness of our country. This same constitution was deliberately and solemnly adopted by the States, though with hesitancy and fears by some of them, and even to this day is venerated and sustained by the people. It has disappointed the fears of its early opponents, and more than realized the sanguine expectations of its friends. This constitution confers on Congress certain powers. These powers are defined and limited. The people of the States have reserved to themselves certain powers and certain rights, limited and defined only by will, so long as they interfere not with the powers vested in Congress. By these reserved powers, in accordance with these reserved rights, certain States recognise property in slaves. The constitution guaranties protection to this property, under certain circumstances, and this guarantee the Congress of the United States, by virtue of its constitutional obligations, is bound to execute. This is one of the conditions of our political compact; and, sir, much as I love the Union, I hold that no State is bound by it or can be bound by it, politically or morally, longer than the constitutional guarantee for the protection of life and property shall be continued and faithfully carried out. And, sir, what is the fugitive slave law but a law to execute this guarantee?

People may honestly differ even in regard to questions of morality. We are so variously constituted, and reared under such a great variety of circumstances, that we cannot all look at things through the same medium. I may think that property in slaves cannot exist on the ground of moral principle. My friend from a slave State, himself a slaveholder, may think differently. Well, if it be an offence against morality to own slaves, the sin is his, not mine. It need not disturb my conscience. The Slavery of the South—if even an unpardonable sin—is not to be answered and atoned for by the people of the North. They have nothing to do with it. Slavery is an institution of the States themselves; and we make ourselves just as ridiculous by decrying those States, and attempting to drive them out of the Union, on account of Slavery, as we should in refusing to consummate a treaty with some foreign nation because that nation held slaves or bowed in devotion to a heathen god.

I feel free to say that I regret that Slavery was ever introduced into any of the States of this Union; and were the question now for its introduction into the United States, no one could more heartily oppose it than I would. I would move heaven and earth to save us from the mighty evil. I would invoke Heaven with all the earnestness and zeal of a parent pleading for his first-born, to avert from my country a curse so heavy. But, sir, it is not so. The evil is among us—the curse rests upon us; and I see no way to remove it, without the creation of an evil greater—a curse more heavy—the ruin of the master and the destruction of the slave.

But, sir, the fugitive law—the law for the rendition of fugitive slaves to their owners—is now the great bone of contention. And certain people seem horrified at the idea that they or anybody else should be required to aid in the execution of this law, and not be saved harmless for its violation. Does this law violate any of my personal rights as a citizens? Does it violate any of the personal rights of any citizen of a free State? Certainly not, except it be a personal right to resist the execution of any law we may not happen to like. That incalculable mischief, and even the destruction of everything in the form of government, would result from such a state of things, requires but few words to show.

Take the rule laid down by the opponents of this law, and make a universal application of it, and see what would be the results. The rule has been denominated the "higher law;" in other words, the moral law; or, in the words of the New Testament, "As we would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." Sir, I give in to no man in my veneration or attachment to this sublime rule of right, the true concentration of all moral ethics; but I do not believe in having it strained, and twisted, and warped, to prove a fabulous theory, while we leave it untouched and unused in other cases, and particularly in cases to which it is legitimately applicable. The application of this law is, as I understand it, that if I were in the condition of the fugitive slave, my wish would be that some one would aid me, and thus evade the law; that hence it becomes my duty to do so, because I should do unto him as I should wish him to do unto me. Now, I hold that to carry this higher law out in this manner, it would be absolutely impossible ever to inflict legal punishment for crime, even on the most atrocious wretch.

Imagine the thief, the robber, the murderer, arraigned before the judicial tribunal. The evidence is direct and positive. Not a doubt of guilt can possibly exist in the mind of any one. But, before conviction, the culprit or his counsel appeal to the court and jury under the "higher law"—the divine law—"As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." Think you, sir, there would be a man on the bench or in the jury box who would not, if in the place of the criminal, wish the judge and jury to acquit him? And if the views of the higher law advocates be correct, why not? A great many people in this country are, in principle, opposed to the punishment of any crime by death; but still such punishment is inflicted by law in most of the States. Would it not be quite as right, quite as much an act of humanity, and quite as much in accordance with the higher law, according to the conscientious views of such persons, to rescue a fellow-being from the gallows, as to rescue a slave from bondage? Why, then, should they not do it under the same rule? But, sir, this law, the higher law, was never designed for any such purpose. Its object was to regulate intercourse between man and man. The spirit that dictated to the servant to be subject to his master could never have enjoined it on others to aid his escape. The same spirit that commanded obedience to the civil magistrate, and those in authority, would never have enjoined it on men to resist the laws.

I know, sir, that the general plea in behalf of this agitation against the fugitive slave law, and for its final repeal, is philanthropy—the professed desire to ameliorate the condition of suffering humanity; but I confess, for one, it is beyond the ken of my mental vision to discover how the cause of philanthropy and humanity is to be promoted by a process tending to produce anarchy, strife, and perhaps civil war and bloodshed, for the sake of aiding the escape of a few fugitives from bondage, and especially when, nine times out of ten, the condition of those fugitives, instead of being improved, is absolutely made worse. My own views of philanthropy and humanity lead me to the conclusion that of two evils we should choose the least; and I certainly form no just estimate of the enormous difference between the evils resulting from the return of a few fugitive slaves to their owners, and those to result to the entire people of the United States, from a course likely to annihilate the glorious fabric of the American Union. And there is still another view of the subject; I shall be borne out in the statement by every resident in a slave State, and by every man from the free States personally conversant with the subject, that, in proportion as the agitators have pushed their movements ahead, the privileges of the slaves have been curtailed; and that for all the fancied benefits secured to the few hundreds of fugitives who have escaped beyond recall, the millions remaining are made to suffer ten-fold disadvantages. Whether such a result in itself be right or wrong, matters not in the argument; the slaveholder has felt himself compelled to act on the defensive to protect himself and his property. Admitting, then, that the hundreds of fugitives may be benefitted by their change, the aid rendered them in the free States, and the settled determination to pursue that course, has indirectly inflicted a ten-fold injury on the remaining millions. On which side, then, is philanthropy? I contend, then, that, even for the sake of the great body of the slaves themselves, this law ought to continue in full force, and to be rigidly executed.

I should have more charity for those who agitate for the repeal of the fugitive law, were they at all consistent. They claim, as their rule of action, the higher law: "As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." This law, as regards fugitive slaves, is interpreted according to its most possible extensive meaning. Thus: as you would a man to do all in his power, even to the violation of law and the rights of property, to rescue you from bondage, so you should do by others. It does most assuredly smack a little of inconsistency, to say the least of it, for a man to give this wide and extensive meaning to the higher law, in this solitary case, and in every other conceivable case in which his own personal interest is brought into it, to narrow its meaning down so as to make it comport with that interest. When the fulfilment of this law, to the extent higher-law men give it, is to cost them nothing, and is to create personal notoriety or political capital, nothing can exceed their show of philanthropy; but bring them down to common transactions of life, and to the affairs of the community of which they are members, where the fulfilment of the higher law, according to their interpretation, will cost money, or involve hazard, and you hear no more of it. Oh, no, that alters the case. It is no longer my ox that gored your bull, but your bull that gored my ox.

Mr. BRIGHT. This is a very interesting, and, to some of us, delicate question. I should like very much, before the vote is taken, to see the Senate full. An unusual number of senators from the free States, on the other side of the chamber, are not in their seats.

Mr. CLEMENS. They have run away on purpose.

Mr. BRIGHT. If they have left for the purpose of avoiding a vote on the amendment of the senator from Massachusetts, it is proper that fact should be known.

Mr. President, I did not vote for the fugitive slave law on the question of its final passage, for the reason that I was not in my place at the time the vote was taken. I was *accidentally* absent. Had I been here it is well understood I would have voted for it. I was honoured with a place on the committee of thirteen which framed and reported the compromise measures. I supported those measures, each and every one of them, separately and collectively, in committee and before the Senate, from the beginning to the end of that controversy, as is well known to the members of that committee and the Senate; and an explanation on this point is only made necessary now from the fact that a failure to vote

by the amendment of the honourable senator from Massachusetts. Nothing I could say would alter his, or the opinions of those fanatics who think and act with him. They are joined to their idols, and have their own peculiar reasons for desiring to continue the agitation of this question. If I felt that it was incumbent on me to find a justification for my support of the "fugitive slave law," I would, as the senator from Illinois has just done, point to the constitution which forms this confederacy, and say that, having taken an oath to support it, so long as I remain a law-maker under it I shall ever hold myself ready and willing to aid in the enactment of all laws having for their object the aid necessary to carry into effect every one of its requirements.

It is unnecessary for me to say that I regard the law proposed to be repealed as necessary to carry out that clause of the constitution which provides that "no person held to service or labour in one State, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due." But the constitution forms no guide for those who advocate the "higher law," and it is rather a waste of time to call their attention to it and seek to enforce its mandates, so far as they are concerned.

While upon the floor, I must be indulged with one other remark in connexion with this important subject; and that is, as to the difference of position of the two great parties in the free States on the subject of domestic Slavery. It is a fact not to be concealed that the great body of the Democratic party of this country are sound on this question. It is an entire mistake to suppose that any considerable portion of that party of the free States are hostile to Southern institutions. Many of them, doubtless, regard Slavery as an evil; but the remedy for that evil they claim no right to prescribe or administer; on the contrary, with one voice, they unite in urging the representatives of their opinions in Congress to carry out the requirements of the constitution in good faith. I wish, sir, I could say as much in behalf of the Whig party of this country. If this remark were true of them, there would not be enough "higher-law" men to be found to make mile-stones of, and we would have peace and quietude here in Congress, instead of the unsound, demoralizing doctrine heard to-day from the senator from Massachusetts.

If my remarks in reference to the comparative soundness of the two parties need confirmation, it may be found in the character and position of the candidates they have chosen to fill the highest executive offices known to the constitution. Had General Pierce and yourself, sir, occupied a doubtful or an equivocal position on the compromise question, neither of you would have been nominated. The known devotion of each of you to this series of measures, before as well as since their passage, contributed in no small degree to place you forward as the standard-bearers of the Democracy. Can any senator on the other side of the chamber say thus much for the Whig party, and for their candidates, particularly General Scott?

A Senator. Yes.

Mr. Bright. I doubt it. It is well known that his equivocal position—claimed as he has been on both sides of this question—gave him the strength *North* that resulted in his nomination; and his peculiar friends and advisers, at least those who are thus understood on this floor, are not now in their places—I allude more particularly to the senator from New York—which is rather a significant fact. Sir, the only way to silence fanaticism, put down agitation and agitators, is for the sound men of all parties to refuse countenance and support to those who will, either directly or by implication, lend themselves to the unholy purposes of those disturbers of the public peace.

Sir, I am against the amendment of the senator from Massachusetts. I am against any and all propositions intended to disturb what are known as the "compromise measures." I am against that class of politicians who cry repeal, and set up the "higher law" as their rule of action, for I have no confidence in their political sincerity. And, sir, in uttering these opinions, it is proper I should say, and I am proud to have it in my power to say, that they are supported by at least nine-tenths of the voters of Indiana. With me the voters of Indiana unite in opposing and repudiating Disunionists South and Abolitionists North; and when gentlemen here undertake to describe the general discontent prevailing against the "compromise measures," the fugitive slave law included, I will exempt the State I represent.

Mr. Cooper. Mr. President, I should not have said a word on this subject if it had not been for the remarks just made by the senator from Indiana [Mr. Bright]. I had a disposition and wish to make a few remarks, but I should have forgone that wish it those remarks had not been made. I am not one of those who find fault with the senator from Massachusetts for occupying the time of the Senate today. It was his right to do it, and I am glad that he has exercised that right, because at last we have fully, broadly, and fairly presented to the country the designs and intentions of the party which he represents. Hitherto, bold as the gentlemen who profess to represent that party upon this floor have been, they have not come out with the fullness and frankness of the senator from Massachusetts. I say I thank him for this full and fair exposition of his views, and of the intentions of those of whom he is a leader. In Pennsylvania that portion of our citizens who have acted in some sort with the party to which that senator belongs, have believed that the war which was made was a war within the constitution. When they are made to understand that it is a war upon the constitution, I tell you that they will be no longer found fighting under that banner; but they will array themselves as hitherto on one side or the other—in the ranks of the Whigs, or in the ranks of the Democrats. If the wish of the senator from Indiana had really been as his words purport, he would not have attempted to introduce party politics into this question. I am never in the habit of referring invidiously to the conduct of parties, as you will all bear me witness, and as my friends, Whigs and Democrats, will bear me witness at home; but when the senator undertakes to say that the candidates of one party were selected with special reference to the soundness of their views upon constitutional questions, and attempts to induce the belief that the candidates on the other side are not equally sound, he does that which the history of the candidates on the Whig side does not warrant him in saying. I will say that the candidate of the Whig party for the Presidency is as sound upon all constitutional subjects as any man in the land. Who can believe that he who has bourne the flag of his country aloft for forty years—who has slept under its folds—under the folds of "the flag of the Union"—could be untrue to that flag, and untrue to that Union? Sir, nobody believes it. That gentleman, too, from his associations—for I have no doubt he has associations, and if he has not, he knows the antecedents of that distinguished man who is the Whig candidate well enough to know that he will faithfully carry out all the provisions of the constitutions with as much fidelity as the candidate of his party.

Mr. Clemens. Will the senator allow me to ask him a question?

The President. The Chair should probably have interfered with the senator from Indiana——

Mr. Cooper. I was about to say——

The President. The Chair is very unwilling that the discusaion should take such a wide range.

Mr. Clemens. I merely wish to ask a question. I know the senator from Pennsylvania has been sound, and has been true upon all these questions. I want him to tell me and the Senate whether he was a Scott man; and if he was not, why he was not?

The President. The question is not one of that nature that the senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Cooper) is bound to answer. The Chair trusts that this discussion will not proceed further. He has been unwilling to arrest the senator from Pennsylvania, inasmuch as he improperly indulged the senator from Indiana.

Mr. Cooper. I was not, it is true, a Scott man before the meeting of the Whig Convention.

Mr. Clemens. I knew it.

Mr. Cooper. But let me tell the senator that whilst I did give my preference to another, I, all the time, on all occasions, professed a knowledge of the views of General Scott upon that subject, and stated to everybody that they were sound. Yes, sir, the senators from North Carolina (Mr. Mangum and Mr. Badger) and the senator from Maryland (Mr. Pearce) knew it.

One word now in relation to the compromise measures. I have been in favour of them, and most of my constituents of both parties are in favour of them, and they will stand by them. I did not vote for the fugitive-slave law; it was not because I disapproved the principle of it, as my friend from Michigan (Mr. Cass) can bear testimony. We discoursed about it; and t would have voted for it if it had had a provision in if which we both desired, although I did not like some of its provisions, because I believe that there could have been others introduced, which would have been made more effectual. But I shall vote against the amendment of the senator from Massachusetts, and I shall vote for the proposition of the Committee on Finance. My constituents will stand by me in all that I do, and instead of reproving me, as they might once have been disposed to do, when they find that the war is made upon the sacred instrument which they regard as the charter of their liberties, they will applaud me.

Mr. Clemens. I have only a word to say, and it is in reference to a statement which the senator has made, that he did not vote for the fugitive-slave law. He said that he conferred with the senator from Michigan, and it is very possible that he conferred with me. I do not know that he did, but I think it possible, for we were in the habit of having free interchange of opinion about that time. I desire the country to know the facts in relation to the matter. The senator from Pennsylvania and the senator from Michigan, as I understood at the time, were both desirous that there should be a provision in the fugitive-slave bill that the slave should have the right of trial by jury in the State from which he had escaped.

Mr Cooper. Yes, sir.

Mr. Cass. That is correct.

Mr. Clemens. Well, a majority of southern men and a portion of northern men voted against that provision. Very possibly I did myself; I am not altogether certain, but I rather think I did vote against it; but it was upon the ground that they had that right already—that there was not a State in the southern portion of the Union which did not give them that right already, and that it was unnecessary to attach it to that bill. I desire the country to know that that was the reason why several of our Democratic friends did not vote for the fugitive-slave law. We of the South voted against that provision because we had it already. They of the North said to us that that fact should be known at the North, and that it would not be known unless it was attached to that bill.

Mr. Cass. Mr. President, I think the time has come when, without any imputation upon me, I can tell all about the fugitive slave law. Nobody will charge me now with any ulterior object one way or the other. But I will tell the whole story. As to my feelings and efforts during the pendency of the compromise measures—the anxiety that I manifested, the exertions that I made, and the motives which influenced me—I need not say one word to the Senate. They all know them. I need not say to the Senate that there was no man more anxious than I was for a settlement of this question—no man who believed that the country was more in peril. And now I am not among those wise men who, when the danger is over, say they believe there was none. I believe that there was danger. I thought so then. To speak in ordinary language, I was almost frightened to death. That is the plain truth, and when an honourable senator from Mississippi, not now here, a very high-minded and honourable man, said to me, would you do so and so to save the Union, proposing some extreme measure, I told him I would go almost any length, do almost anything in the world to save the Union. I would have voted for twenty fugitive slave laws, if I had believed the safety of the Union depended upon my doing so. I will state the fact, that the reason why I did not tell it sooner was, that I did not think my own self-respect would justify me in doing so. My friends knew all about it, and if I had told it publicly I should have been charged with bidding for public favour. I despise such a motive. No such thing can now be ascribed to me, and therefore I will tell the whole story.

When we came here at the commencement of the last long session of Congress, no man was more urgent than I was to have an efficient fugitive slave law passed. I believe I was one of the earliest who mentioned the subject in the Senate. I said that all other business should be laid aside for that—that it was the great and crying evil of the South, which the northern and middle States of the Union should remedy. On one occasion, early in the session, the senator from Indiana not now in his seat (Mr. Whitcomb), and myself had a conversation on the subject; and we went to General Foote and requested him to see the southern senators and tell them from us that at any moment they indicated, we should be willing and glad to take up their bill, and put through a stringent fugitive slave law. There has been some difficulty about the statement of that fact. General Foote reported to us that the southern gentlemen would not agree to it. That is all I have to say about it. I have no further voucher to that fact here now than the honourable senator from Pennsylvania, who knows all about it as well as I do.

So things went on till about the middle of the session. I then inquired in a speech how far we ought to go; and I said we ought to give the South a very stringent law. I said expressly that I would not allow a writ of *habeas corpus* to stay proceedings; and would not allow a trial by jury in the place where the fugitive slave was arrested.

When the committee of thirteen on the compromise measures began their labours, as gentlemen here know, there was a proposition made for a stringent fugitive slave law. One was reported by that committee which seemed to be acceptable to a great majority of the people; and it contained the main features of the law as it now is, with a provision that if, when a fugitive slave was taken, he should assert that he was not a slave, the commissioner, after he made his decision in favour of the master, should repeat the question to the fugitive: "Do you persist in denying that you are a slave?" and if he said that he was not a slave, the provision was that the master or his agent should give bond in $1,000, without security, that within a given period after the return, that slave should be entitled to a trial by jury in the county from which he had escaped. Now, I never could conceive, and mortal man never could explain to me, why that should not have been put into the bill.

Mr. Clemens. It was the law already in nearly if not all the southern States.

Mr. Cass. Then, why in the name of all that is just and proper was it not put in that bill? It was said by a southern gentleman that there was such a provision in their State laws. Then, why was it not put into that bill? Of course, we could not interfere with State laws. We only proposed to require them to give the fugitive the benefit of the State laws. That was the sole and simple provision. Mr. President, you know it, and every gentleman of the senate knows it. If that provision had been inserted in the bill as it finally passed, it would have taken away a great many of the objections to the law. Mr. Clay was in favour of it, and a number of southern gentlemen in committee were in favour of it. Gen. Foote was in favour of it, and a number of others were for it. I said in the outset, if you put that provision in, I will agree to almost anything else you may put in the bill; but if you do not, I will not vote for it. That is what I said in the beginning, in the middle, and in the end, and what I say now. I would not yield the point. That was the whole fact about it. When we were prepared to give the South as stringent a law as the constitution demanded, why should they suffer such a mere appearance as that, if you may so call it, to be sacrificed unnecessarily, particularly when it was known that if that provision had been inserted it would have removed a great deal of difficulty in the northern mind, to which the bill, as it passed, has given rise? That was the state of the case

I believe there is hardly a feature in the bill for which, individually, I did not vote from beginning to end. My votes are recorded on the yeas and nays. But I did not vote for the bill on its final passage, for the simple reason that I would not yield that point.

Sir, the fugitive slave law is now in force. It shall never be touched, or altered, or shaken, or repealed by any vote of mine. That is the plain English of it. I consider that it is one of the sacred compromises of the constitution, and I may almost say that it is the only part the South got in the settlement of these questions. There are considerations connected with this question which may be discussed at some time, but they should not be discussed now. I simply intended to confine myself to the reason why I did not vote for the fugitive slave law as it passed.

Mr. Butler. Perhaps it is my duty to say something as a witness rather than in any other way, in relation to this fugitive slave law.

Mr. Brodhead. If the senator from South Carolina [Mr. Butler] will permit me, I should like to say a word in reply to what has been said by my colleague [Mr. Cooper]. Mr. President, I think I can say with truth, that since I have been a member of this body I have endeavoured to make myself useful as a working man rather than conspicuous in the way of speech making; but the remarks which were made a few minutes ago by my colleague call for a word of reply from me.

Sir, my colleague and friend is not the leader of the Scott party in Pennsylvania. He justly deserves to be the leader of the whig party, but he is not the leader of the Scott Whig party of the present day in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Clemens. He admitted that much.

Mr. Mangum. Is it in order to go into a presidential discussion on this question?

The President. The Chair has already stated that he did not interrupt the senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Cooper], in consequence of the remarks which fell from the senator from Indiana; but the Chair hopes that senators will see the propriety of not entering into any discussion with regard to the presidential canvass or the presidential election.

Mr. Brodhead. I supposed it was not strictly in order, but the remark of my colleague seemed to require some notice on my part. He spoke of the position of the Whig candidate on this subject in Pennsylvania. I want to speak on the same subject.

Several Senators. Go on.

Mr. Mangum. Are we to understand that there is to be a general discussion on presidential questions now?

The President. According to the rules, such a discussion is not in order.

Mr. Hunter. I hope the chair will enforce the rules, or we shall never get through the appropriation bills.

The President. The Chair will enforce the rules.

Mr. Cooper. To relieve my friend and colleague I will state at once that I have never stated nor insinuated that the candidate of the opposing party was not perfectly sound on this subject.

Mr. Brodhead. But the purpose of the remarks which I want to make is to show that the Whig party of Pennsylvania, with Governor Johnston at its head, is unsound.

The President. The Chair cannot suffer discussion to go on on this subject. The question is on the amendment of the senator from Massachusetts to the amendment of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. Butler. I might, according to the example which has been set us, go into the whole history of the fugitive slave law, but I am willing that the truth of history shall come out in almost any other way than in explanations here. I may say, in relation to these matters that *magna pars fui*—I was one of those consulted—by way of setting a good example, I will forego the opportunity of telling the truth, and take my seat [laughter].

Mr. Douglas. I shall not reopen this discussion. I have only one word to say upon this point of courtesy that we have heard so much about, in respect to refusing the senator from Massachusetts an opportunity to make his speech some time ago. He has complained of it to-day as an unexampled act of discourtesy, and the senator from Ohio [Mr. Chase] has referred to it as a discourtesy which he had never known to be practised before. I have had various newspapers sent to me, from Massachusetts and other parts of the country, in which I among others am personally abused for that alleged act of discourtesy. The facts are these: There had been pending before the Senate a bill to protect the emigrant route to the Pacific. That bill had been recommitted, and I, as chairman of the Committee on Territories, had reported a substitute for it, providing for a railroad to the Pacific. That bill had been made the special order for a particular day. I was in New York the day previous to the day on which it was to be taken up and discussed. I had the floor for that day; and I rode all night in the cars from New York to be here to occupy the floor on the day that I was entitled to it by the vote of the Senate and by the understanding at the time. On that morning the senator from Massachusetts came into the Senate chamber and commanded the floor, on the Slavery question, to my exclusion. I certainly voted against allowing him to occupy the floor when I was entitled to it. He wanted it for a political speech; I wanted it for the practical business of the Senate. The Senate voted him down, and then voted me down, and went on with another bill which was pending; but I did not regard the act as one of discourtesy to me, because I was voted down in order that the Senate might go on with a measure which seemed to them of more pressing importance: But the senator from Massachusetts was the last man who was entitled to the floor on that day according to the usage of courtesy of this body.

Mr. Pratt. I regret that the honourable senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Brodhead] was not permitted to make the remarks which he intended to make. He had, however, gone just as far as he could have gone, by making this assertion, which goes to the country, that he was prepared to prove that the Whig party were not sound upon this subject.

The President. The Chair will have to interfere with the honourable senator.

Mr. Pratt. I do not intend to make any remark which will elicit debate. I merely wish to reply to the senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Brodhead. I spoke of the Whig party in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Pratt. Now, sir, I say there is not a Whig in Pennsylvania who is not sound on this subject. I say that the man who is not sound is neither a Whig nor a Democrat [laughter].

The President. The Chair will be under the necessity——

Mr. Pratt. I must be permitted to proceed. Everybody else has been.

The President. The Chair interfered with the senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Brodhead].

Mr. Pratt. I say that both the great parties of this country have put before the country a platform, upon which the candidates of those parties stand, and upon which, as men of honour, they are pledged to stand. A man, therefore, who is not sound on this subject, whether in Pennsylvania or anywhere, is not a Whig nor a Democrat.

Mr. Hale. I will take them (laughter).

Mr. Pratt. The senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Hale) says he will take them. He is the only one to have them, for they do not belong to either the Whig or Democratic party.

Mr. Mason. Mr. President, I do not mean at all to enter into a discussion as to the repeal of the fugitive slave law. I intend only to advert to what fell from the senator from Michigan (Mr. Cass), and the senator from Alabama Mr. Clemens), lest by possibility hereafter there might be some doubt or misconstruction as to the character of this law. The senator from Michigan has declared that he refused to vote for the fugitive slave law because it did not contain a provision which had been reported by the committee of thirteen, providing that the claimant of a fugitive from labour should be required to give bond that he would allow the fugitive to have a jury trial in the State to which he was returned.

Mr. Cass. A bond without security.

Mr. Mason. Yes, sir, a bond without security. Now, the history of that matter was this: It was an amendment offered in the committee of thirteen by a senator from Massachusetts, not now a member of this body (Mr. Webster). That is my impression.

Mr. Cass. The gentleman is mistaken. My colleague (Mr. Felch) wrote it out for me, and he will vouch for the fact.

Mr. Mangum. I think the senator from Michigan (Mr. Cass) presented it.

Mr. Mason. That may be so. I was not present in the committee when it was offered, but I was under the impression that it had been offered by the senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Webster), but that is immaterial. It was reported by that committee to the Senate. The senator from Alabama is perfectly right, as far as he has gone. It was objected on the part of southern men that it was unnecessary to make that provision in the law, because in all the southern States the fugitive could have that right without this provision being in the law; but the true objection—certainly that which governed me—was this: the constitution says that the fugitive "shall be delivered up on claim"—that he shall be delivered up without any condition whatsoever; and I believed that if the law required the master to give a bond without security, it was yielding to the jurisdiction of Congress that which would thereafter prove fatal; because if Congress had a right to exact that bond it might be argued that it had an equal right to exact a bond with security. It was that reason which operated with me in resisting that amendment.

Mr. Clemens. I spoke only of the objection made here in the Senate chamber. There is no man who knows better than does the senator from Virginia, the senator from Louisiana (Mr. Downs), or myself, the objections made by southern men outside I did not allude to them. I only spoke of those made in the Senate. Our objections in the Senate were that there was already such a provision.

Mr. Mason. I think the debate will show that I urged the objection of which I spoke.

Mr. Clemens. I think not in the Senate; but it was urged outside.

The question being then taken by yeas and nays on Mr. Sumner's amendment to the amendment of the committee it was rejected—yeas 4, nays 46—as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Chase, Hale, Sumner, and Wade—4.

Nays—Messrs. Adams, Badger, Bayard, Bell, Borland, Bradbury, Bright, Brodhead, Brooke. Butler, Cass, Charlton, Blarke, Clemens, Cooper, Dawson, Desaussure, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Felch, Fish, Geyer, Gwin, Hamlin, Houston, Hunter, James, Jones of Iowa, King, Mallory, Mangum, Mason, Meriwether, Miller, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Shields, Smith, Soule, Spruance, Toucey, Underwood, Upham, Walker, and Weller—47.

## JOHN P. HALE IN OHIO.

Mt. Vernon, Ohio, Friday, Oct. 1, 1852.

Hon. John P. Hale—*Dear Sir:* Hon. Daniel R. Tilden was in this place on the 25th ult., when in conversation with a few individuals, he stated that in a private circle of friends in Cleveland, he among the number, you stated, in substance, this: "That you were in favour of the election of Gen. Scott; that your purpose in coming to the West was to secure that object, and that if your present course was not found best for that end, you would adopt some other;" and the reason you had for doing so, as Mr. Tilden made the impression, *was that you consider the interests of Freedom would be comparatively safe in his hands.*

Believing that you never made such statements, and for the purpose of putting a stop to the use that is being made of them, we trust that you will favour us with a reply in reference to the matter.

Very respectfully,

John A. Reed, L. Chadwick, Wm. Turner } Free Soil Com.

Cleveland, Saturday, Oct. 2, 1852.

*Gentlemen:* Your favour of the 1st inst., is before me, in which you give certain statements which Hon. Daniel R. Tilden is said to have made relative to a conversation I had in a private circle of friends in Cleveland—he being of the number.

I have neither time nor recollection sufficient to state what conversation I have had in Cleveland; but I can state most unequivocally, and without hesitation, that I never had any such conversation with Mr. Tilden, nor any one else, in a circle of friends in Cleveland, nor elsewhere.

Soon after my arrival in Cleveland—I think the same day—Mr. Tilden called on me at my lodgings and requested of me a private and confidential interview. As I had known Mr. Tilden in Congress, and had a high regard for him as a man of integrity, and also as one who had been known as an Anti-Slavery man, the interview was readily granted. Mr. Tilden represented to me that he had great fears of the consequences that would result from the election of Mr. Pierce, adverse to the cause of freedom—to all which I assented, and told him I was as much opposed to the election of Pierce as he was. He further represented that my coming into Ohio would have a direct tendency to bring about the very result which I deprecated, and that the only effect of my labours in Ohio would be the defeat of the very object I desired to promote, viz: the success of the cause of Freedom.

From this I dissented, and told him I did not think it was so; and that if I had thought that my visit to Ohio would be the occasion of aiding and strengthening the cause of Slavery, I certainly should not have come.

This is the amount of the conversation as I recollect it.

I have not probably given the whole; but I utterly deny, and challenge the proof to the contrary, that I have, in any private conversation with any one since I came into Ohio, uttered a word at variance with, or inconsistent with what I have said in my public addresses. If this conversation was had with a circle of friends, let any and all of them be called to contradict me, if I have not stated the truth. My public addresses are before the public, and any one has a perfect right to draw from them, or any one of them, any inference which may fairly be deduced from them. But no man, or set of men, have a right, from conversation in private, which are in perfect accordance with my public speaking, to form conclusions of their own, and then publish them as my sayings.

I have stated that, when Mr. Tilden sought a conversation with me he desired that it should be a confidential one; but I have no desire for any such shield to protect me from anything I have said. He and every other man in this State has my full permission to publish, as fully as they may wish, everything I have said to them.

Trusting that I have fully answered your letter, I remain, with much respect, your friend,

John P. Hale.


## National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* Sydney Howard Gay, *New-York.*

†† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* Francis Jackson, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* Sydney Howard Gay, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1852.


## THE DISTINCTION WITHOUT A DIFFERENCE.

It is an anomalous state of things that this country presents to view at this time. One unprecedented in our history up to this date. A Contest raging for the Presidency between two sets of men, one of which can hardly be distinguished from the other by the closest observer. The Presidency of the United States is a great prize—perhaps the greatest in all the Lotteries which go on in this Vanity Fair the World, and there is never any lack of adventurers desirous of drawing it. Never before were there so many competitors for the great Chance, as this year. And yet never before was it so hard to tell what is the difference between one of them and another, or why General Scott should not have it as well as General Pierce, or the other way. Presidential Contests have generally been quite enough of squabbles between the *Ins* and the *Outs*, but this is more than enough so. It is that altogether and nothing else. And it is very hard to get up even a decent show or pretence of its being anything else. If Party be the Madness of Many for the gain of a Few, its present phase must be very Midsummer Madness, for there is nothing to go mad about. It is mere *amateur* Distraction. There is no reason why one party should not vote for the candidate of the other. They are equally good in being equally bad. Their bad parts, as Beatrice said of Benedick's, "maintain so politic a state of evil that they will not admit any good part to intermingle with them." And therefore have they fallen in love with them, severally, for all of them together.

We were hardly correct in saying that the Presidential Contest was *raging* at this time—for that would imply a strong degree of interest felt in the conflict by the nation at large. We believe that there never was an Election that created so little emotion, or about the result of which there prevailed such a general indifference. Unless it were at Monroe's second Election, when there was no Contest at all. The want of something to talk about may keep alive a show of interest, and the Second Nature of an American, Voting, will carry the masses of the People to the Polls; but nobody seems to care much for the issue—excepting, indeed, that patriotic class, on the one side and the other, who hold themselves and their friends the only fit persons to have the handling of the public money. It is, in the main, a Battle, not of the Books, but of the Book-keepers, of tide-waiters and excisemen, of postmasters and collectors. The nation at large calmly resigns itself to the duty of umpire in this contention—liking the fight, but caring very little which *whips*. The South, even, is in a state of blessed indifference, for she has arranged matters in such a way that the choice of either man will be a victory for her. She has reduced to practice the suggestion of the man in the farce, when he proposes to decide a disputed point by tossing up a penny—"Heads, I win—tails, you lose!" She cogged the dice before the game begun, so that whichever gets it, she is sure to rise the winner.

Always before, there was some make-believe, at least, of a difference of principles. From the Constitution of the Federal Government down to the Fall of Bonaparte there were real, substantial parties which divided on opinions involving the very existence and independence of the Nation. One party believed that the other was plotting to re-establish monarchical and aristocratic institutions, from their strong leaning towards England; while the other held that their opponents were ready to sacrifice the honour and independence of America to the ambition of France, and that between fear of France and hatred of England they were content to make of America a new Venice or another Holland, a despised and dependant tributary, so that the aggrandizement of the one Power and the humiliation of the other might be promoted. When parties revived and re-arranged their elements, after the *interregrum* of Mr. Monroe's "Era of Good Feeling," they were dwarfed and dwindled from what they were in the days when there were Giants in the Land. They smacked of the Shop rather than of the Senate, of the Counter more than of the Cabinet. The principles involved were such as could be best carried in the breeches-pocket. Great Ideas had given place to small ones, and all that men quarreled about was as to how money was best to be made and safest to be kept. Perfectly proper topics for legislative discussion. But even General Jackson could not erect the United States Bank into such a Monster as Bonaparte used to be; and Daniel Webster himself could not make the question of Tariff and Free Trade stir the souls of men as did the question whether we should have any Trade and any Independent Existence, at all.

But, still, they were points of difference which were appreciated, and, though small, were large enough for parties to hinge upon. And so it went on until the Anti-Slavery Movement excited the apprehensions of the sagacious Slaveholders, and they reached out their hands and laid hold upon Texas as a Zoar, into which they might fly from the consuming fire which they saw impending. This gave occasion to a brief struggle which something resembled the old conflicts of two score years before. But the danger was more remote. France, under her "pagod thing of sabre-away," was not waiting her time to devour us last after swallowing up all the princedoms of Europe. Trade, instead of being endangered, was to be promoted, and so the North succumbed, declaring by the mouth of her most authentic oracles that "it was too late!" and that remonstrance "might be attended with bad results!" So that passed away into the Domain of History, and the greater Enormity of the Mexican Piracy came sweeping by after it. There was another great question calling for the rallying of the Nation into two great parties. And it did have the effect of creating the nucleus of a Great Party yet to be developed. But California offered her yellow sands to bribe the North to submission, the treachery of Webster gave up all the rest to Slavery, and the golden opportunity was lost forever. Now there seems another Era of Good Feeling! All are of one mind as to those Villanies, and both the candidates won their nominations on the Battle fields of Mexico!

But we think that this silence is rather ominous than hopeful for the Ruling Power. It takes a Nation accustomed to unjust and wicked rulers a long time to shake off the yoke. The Reactions of Europe and the fate of France for the last Sixty years are full of instruction on this point. But the spirit which has annihilated the Dynasty of the Capets and shook every Continental throne to its foundation, though laid for a time, is not dead. It must revive again, for it came forth from the holiest recesses of the human heart, and it will yet return and do its perfect work. Europe must be regenerated, because the spirit that God breathed into man demands it and will extort it. And so it must be here. We have for years and years submitted to be bullied and tricked by a base and treacherous oligarchy into doing acts and conniving at practices which make the Heavens weep. The spirit of resistance to that Oligarchy has been evoked. All the threats and all the force that can be arrayed against it, can have no power to exorcise it. Its power is acknowledged in the very violence and uproar that its presence excites, and is witnessed unto by the very atrocities which have been committed to guard against it. Both the great parties have bowed down to Slavery in hopes that she would touch its favourite with the sceptre. One or the other she must disappoint. Perhaps it may be shown that the North is a safer hope for Presidents that are to be than the South. And out of this confusion a better concord will arise.

The lull which now broods over the land cannot prevail long. Under the surface which looks so stagnant and moveless, mighty passions lurk. All men are not made to be the tools or the victims of tyranny. There is always a remnant left whose Protest is mighty. There is but one form of Tyranny that has grown worse as it has grown older, which has learnt nothing and forgotten nothing, and that is Chattel Slavery. And the chosen home of that Tyranny is the American Republic—which not only endures it for others, but courts its chain and lash for herself! It is not in Man's Nature, nor in God's Nature, that these things should endure forever. Victoria I. sits on the throne of Henry VIII.; but how different is her rule? And why? Because a minority has been ever at work moulding opinions and shaping institutions, until it has formed the most perfect system of Constitutional government that the world has yet seen. And the same force will continue to retrench its redundancies and remedy its defects. There is no reason why our institutions should not be made anew in that Republican Image the form of which they now disgrace. And it must and will be done; if not by this generation, by a better yet to come. But we verily believe that some be yet alive that will see the coming of that day.

E. Q.

A Mare's Nest.—The "Satanic Press," the name by which its daily contemporaries designate the *New York Herald*, in preference, it would seem, to the equally appropriate one of Asanine, has lately found a new mare's nest, and has been braying over it for the last week. It received—or, rather it published, for no sane man would take the responsibility of vouching for its reception—a letter purporting to come from "Williams & Lockhart, 17 Change Alley, London," in which was enclosed—it is said—a Bank of England note for £50. In addition to this, the editor of the Press aforesaid was authorized to draw a further sum of two hundred pounds, on condition that it would use its influence to defeat the election of one General Wallbridge, a Democratic nominee for Congress from a City District. The reason given for this extraordinary request by Messrs. "Williams & Lockhart" was that the said General Wallbridge had, about a year since, in London, indulged himself in certain stock-jobbing operations in which the purchasers of the stock sold by him came off second best; that he had also borrowed money from certain persons which he never repaid; and that at the July banquet of Mr. Peabody, the London banker, he had indulged too freely in strong potations, and intimated the patriotic intention on the part of the United States of licking the Universe. If there really be any such persons in Change Alley, London, as Messrs. "Williams & Lockhart" it is very clear they never were out of it, if they think that such facts in the life of any man are a reason why he should not be elected to the American Congress.

But the gist of their letter, and that which aroused the virtuous indignation of the *Herald*, is in the following paragraph:

We are quite sure that our late member from the Tower Hamlets, Mr. George Thompson, would visit the United States, and address his friends against countenancing any measure which would place this *General Wallbridge* in nomination, if you should deem it advisable. At all events, he will write to his particular friends by this steamer, as to what course should be pursued; and our Mr. Williams has, by by a prior steamer, also written to Mr. Hart, the sitting member from your city, who, it is understood, is a gentleman of great wealth and high consideration with his constituency.

Herein lies the secret of the whole plot. "It is evident," says the *Herald*, "from the introduction of the name of the notorious George Thompson, and the intentions indicated with this view, that the purposes understood between the stock jobbers of London and the British Anti-Slavery party, are to affect, by money and otherwise, the elections in this country, in a way favourable to the Anti-Slavery cause, so completely identified with William H. Seward." The charges against General Wallbridge are all "leather and prunella;" the real object is to defeat his election, and put in some Whig in his place, whence would follow the Abolition of Slavery, the Dissolution of the Union, and universal anarchy on the American Continent, and all at the low price of two hundred and fifty pounds.

The day following the disclosure by the *Herald* of this astounding gun-cotton plot, brought forth letters from Mr. Hart, enclosing the one referred to from "our Mr. Williams," in which the charges against General Wallbridge were reiterated, and from Gen. Wallbridge himself. From the last epistle we are quite convinced that if the latter never made use in London of any expressions of hostile intentions on the part of this country towards the rest of creation, that he is himself quite able, single-handed, to put a nation or two upon their good behaviour. How he ventured to beard the lion in his den we may learn from the following extract:

The malignity of my accusers has overshot the mark. At the complimentary dinner given to Capt. West (because his noble craft had outrode the storms and tempests of her great namesake, and was there safe), by the American merchants in Manchester, in response to the sentiment to which I had the honour of replying, I adverted to the intricate commercial relations between Great Britain and the United States, and expressed my hearty disgust that while we, as Americans, were in the very heart of England, exchanging civilities and festive exercises, a distinguished member of the British Parliament was traversing our own country, and treasonably endeavouring to array, in hostile strife, one section of our countrymen against the other. The company readily recognised the allusion to George Thompson, the Abolitionist, and it was re-echoed by a general rising, and the most enthusiastic applause, as any man can testify who was present upon that occasion.

*Hinc illæ lachymæ.* The thin-skinned George Thompson, who was never hissed in his life, who was never opposed by anybody in anything, whose path hitherto has been strewed with roses, goaded to madness by the tremendous sarcasm of this tremendous General, has got up a conspiracy among the bankers of Change Alley to go in, to the amount of two hundred and fifty pounds sterling, for the overthrow of the American Union, and other American Institutions by the defeat of a New York Locofoco in a Congressional election! When Mr. Thompson comes to fulfil his part in this magnificent scheme, we know he will call at the office of the American Anti-Slavery Society to arrange the details of the campaign. When the time arrives, we promise our readers all the particulars.

The Jerry Rescue Trials recommence at Albany, before the U. S. District Court, Judges Hall and Wilson presiding, on Thursday of this week.

## SLAVERY IN LIBERIA.

The charge has been more than once made, and a often contradicted, that Slavery exists, and the Slave Trade is carried on, in the Colony of Liberia. There is never, according to the proverb, any smoke without some fire, and it is hard to believe that a charge made by different persons, at different times, and unknown to each other, yet agreeing on this one point in regard to Liberia, is altogether without foundation. It was made years ago by Dr. Bacon, who went to Africa on behalf of the Amer. Colonisation Society, and remained there for a considerable period; it has been made more recently by Captain Forbes, of the British Navy, who had no other interest in Liberia than as one point, among many others which he visited, on the Coast, and described in a book of voyages; and it has been made again still more recently, by two ladies, one a missionary, and the other a resident of the Colony for three years. A correspondent of a Cincinnati paper, Mr. John Rankin, makes the following statement:

A missionary lady sent to Africa, by the Presbyterian Board, writes, Dec. 12th, 1851, as follows:

"Monrovia is the Capital of Liberia, a colony which extends some two hundred miles along the coast, established by the American Colonisation Society in 1821, for the purpose of preventing the slave trade along the coast, and likewise a home for liberated slaves from the United States. These are both good objects, if they were well carried out. But I have heard it said, here, that there have been slaves shipped out of the colony, within the last year. And many emancipated slaves have died from the effects of the climate, and the want of the means of support."

A Presbyterian lady, who resided in Liberia three years, gives the following statements:

"1st. That many of the colonists hold slaves, and that the President owns thirty or forty slaves.

"2d. That slaves can be purchased from the natives for articles of goods worth four or five dollars.

"3d. That slaves are cruelly treated, and the instrument of torture is a whip containing a number of large lashes with knots on the ends. With this the slaves are scourged on their naked backs until, in some cases, the flesh is laid open in large gashes.

"4th. That slaves are held in a very degraded condition. When they go to church they are made either to sit outside at the door, or if they come inside, to sit on the floor. The same lady also states that of one hundred and sixty-five emigrants, all but sixty died in four weeks."

The lady, who gave these statements, is a church member in good and regular standing, and is esteemed a woman of truth.

"If these statements," adds Mr. Rankin, after some comments upon them, "are not true, they can be refuted."

Their truth is denied, but they have not yet, to our knowledge, been refuted. A Colonisation meeting was held in this city a few evenings since, at which, among other addresses, was one by a Mr. Roberts, announced as a brother of Governor Roberts, of Liberia. He alluded to the statement of Mr. Rankin, but contented himself with simply declaring it to be untrue. He had lived in Liberia, he said, for several years, and no Slavery existed in the Colony. Perhaps this is all the notice the Colonisationists will think it necessary to give to the allegation; and if they have no better evidence to offer, it is unquestionably the wisest thing for them to do. People who are not Colonisationists, in that case, have only to satisfy themselves which party is most worthy of

Free Democracy, we have nominated candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency.

John P. Hale and George W. Julian, if indeed not already prepared to represent the Liberty Party, will, we believe, be prepared to do so, ere long. But our candidate, Mr. Goodell, does now represent it. In him is a present as well as unambiguous and full representative of its great and ultimately triumphant principles. We cannot speak as strongly of our other candidate, Mr. Bell; for he is comparatively a stranger to us. Nevertheless, from the fact that he subscribed the Minority or Liberty Party Report at Pittsburgh, we infer that the principles of the Liberty Party are his principles.

Pre-eminently entitled, as are Mr. Goodell and Mr. Bell to a large vote, we nevertheless expect that it will be very small. It would be small, even were it the vote of all the members of their Party. But much smaller will it be, now, that so many of its members, believing that Mr. Hale and Mr. Julian do, already, hold to all the great principles of the Liberty Party, will, therefore, vote for them, instead of for Mr. Goodell and Mr. Bell. Whilst, however, we shall not reproach them for so voting, we, nevertheless, believe that the voting of Liberty Party men for Messrs. Hale and Julian is, to say the least, premature. On the other hand, we believe that, in no event, can our voting for Messrs. Goodell and Bell prove a matter of regret to us. Such voting will contribute to continue the organization of the Liberty Party: and the continued organization of that Party cannot fail to promote the improvement and success of the Free Democracy. Again, should it turn out, as we believe it will not, that the Free Democracy, instead of advancing and triumphing, shall fall back and perish, then there will remain, in the surviving Liberty Party, a sound nucleus, around which political reformers can gather for the accomplishment of their high and holy objects.

NEW YORK STATE LIBERTY PARTY.

The Convention of the New York State Liberty Party, held in Syracuse, Sept. 30th and Oct. 1st, 1852, nominated

WILLIAM R. SMITH, of Wayne, for Governor.

J. PRESTON MANN, of Jefferson, for Lieutenant Governor.

CHARLES A. WHEATON, of Onondago, for Canal Commissioner.

WILLIAM SHAPCOTT, of Cayuga, for State Prison Inspector.

The Convention also nominated Presidential Electors.

William Shapcott, of Auburn, will furnish, without charge, State tickets and Electoral Tickets to those who may apply to him for them. It is hoped that he will have applications from many Counties.

## *DR. PARKER AND MRS. STOWE.*

THE controversy between Dr. Parker and Mr. Beecher is still before the public, and seems as far from a settlement as ever. To Mr. Beecher's Reply, the *New York Observer* has published a rejoinder, in which the most interesting and conclusive point is that probably, as "Mr. Beecher has reiterated the original calumny, the case will take the course of law." Dr. Parker, however, has replied to Mr. Beecher, in which he gives no intimation of intending to resort to such a measure. His reply is published in the Daily papers of this city, and is as follows:

A CARD.

I deem it proper to say in this manner that it is not my design to enter inter into a newspaper controversy with Rev. Henry Ward Beecher. The difficulties between me and Mrs. Stowe were thrust upon the public by herself and her brother, without my knowledge or consent, or that of my legal counsel. For the unpleasant consequences that have followed, they only are responsible. In respect to Mr. Beecher's account of the interview between him and myself, besides my assertion that I did not give him any sort of permission to publish the letters, I offer: 1. My letter to Professor Stowe, written two hours after Mr Beecher left my study, but *omitted* in Mr. Beecher's report of the correspondence; 2dly, Mr. Beecher's letter to Mrs. Stowe, giving *his* account of the interview; 3dly, Mrs. Stowe's letter to me, giving *Mr. Beecher's* account to her of the interview; and 4tly, Mr. Butler's letter, giving *Mr. Beecher's* account to him of the interview a few minutes after it took place In no one of these four narratives is there any allusion to my having signed or consented to the publication of those letters. The terms in which Mr. Beecher speaks of me in his letter to Mrs. Stowe, and the explanation of his designs in drawing up the letter for Mrs. Stowe to sign, sufficiently indicate Mr. Beecher's intention. It cannot be expected, after this, that I should take any further steps toward the private settlement of the dispute, but I shall receive and entertain with kindness any proposition which may be made in the spirit of Professor Stowe's last communication to me. This communication, which is of material interest, was *also omitted* in Mr. Beecher's account of the correspondence in *The Independent*, but will be found in *The New York Observer* of October 7.

I subjoin the letters referred to above, and request those papers which have printed Mr. Beecher's statement to copy this card with the appended communication.

JOEL PARKER.

1. *My Letter to Professor Stowe*

NEW YORK, Wednesday, June 9, 1852

REV. C. E. STOWE, D.D.—*Dear Sir:* Your very kind note of the 7th has just come to hand. But an hour before receiving it, I had a friendly interview with the Rev. H. W. Beecher—an interview that seems to me to promise an amicable arrangement. I am much obliged for all the kind things you say of your friendship, and that of Dr. Lyman Beecher for me. I have no doubt that friendship has been sincere. On my part it has been heartily reciprocated. You may rest assured that I shall not be impatient. I desire nothing but the simplest and plainest justice, and will not make for you intentionally a particle of unnecessary trouble.

Yours truly, JOEL PARKER.

2. *Rev. H. W. Beecher's Account of the Interview in The Independent.*

I inclosed the correspondence to Mrs. Stowe, and wrote the following note to accompany it, which note is certainly not reverent as it should be, but it shows the honourable intentions I entertained toward Dr. Parker.

After criticising her card, I, as attempting to do too many things, as on that account failing to produce the impression which she desired, I proceeded to say:

(Copy.)

3. When an apology is made before the public, it ought to be explicit as at once to gain for the maker the credit of honesty, frankness and honour; and *then*, if afterward you have aught to say, it will be kindly taken.

Nevertheless, I took it to Joel. He made wry faces. We tinkered a little, as you will see, and in this shape he agreed to let it go. But I felt bad about it. I said to him, "Mr. Parker, I don't like the whole thing. If you will give me pen and ink, and leave me alone, I will write one to my mind." So I wrote the inclosed, i. e., two letters as from him and one as from you. I am satisfied that these will make a good impression.

You will see that you do not commit yourself as to whether he ever said, in any *other* controversy, this thing. You express a judgment made upon documents presented. Besides, I am quite satisfied that he *has* been misrepresented in that regard. That being the case, I desire much an unequivocal statement on that point. *Then* the statement of the way in which you got hold of the thing will have force both to exculpate you and to show that he brought the infliction on his own head.

If you approve this, send a copy, in your handwriting, to Wm. Harned, A. S. Rooms, No. 48 Beekman street, New York, and he will see to its insertion in *Tribune*, *Era* and *Independent*.

(Signed) Truly yours, H. W. B.

I leave for Indiana, Monday.

3. *Mrs. Stowe's Letter to Me.*

BRUNSWICK, Friday, July 2, 1852.

REV. MR. PARKER—*Dear Sir:* As your letter, addressed to my husband, is one that I can answer better than he, I shall now reply to it by stating to you briefly all I know of the matter under consideration.

The card which I sent to my brother contained what I then supposed, and do still suppose, to be a fair and just exposition of the whole state of the case. I received a letter in reply from my brother, in which he stated that he had shown that card to you—that you and he had together variously amended and altered it in regard to expression, until you were brought to some degree of unanimity upon it. My brother then went on to say that he said to you, Mr. Parker, the wording of this does not exactly please me, and I think if you will give me liberty to draw up a form, I can produce one that will give satisfaction to both sides. He went on to say that he now sent me this form, which, if I was willing to accede to it and adopt as my language, I was to copy with my own handwriting, and send to the care of Mr. William Harned, who would see to its insertion in *The Era*, *Tribune* and *Independent*.

I was of the opinion at the time that the card I had sent was a more just and fair expose of the subject, and I should have much preferred its publication. But I thought if you were willing to consent to this adjustment, I ought to be willing also, and upon consideration I came to the conclusion that it was the best expression which could be given.

In it you were represented as acting with the courtesy and dignity which become a Christian man of honour, and I expressed what I sincerely feel, a pleasure in repairing any unintentional injury which I might have done you.

Nothing could have been more surprising than the receipt of your letter. You will perceive at once that the case lies between you and my brother Henry, who, judging from the tone of his letter to me, considered himself to be acting with all kindness, fairness and good faith, *as he always does act*. I think he will be equally surprised with myself to learn that you do not consider yourself to have assented to those letters.

When my brother returns, which will be soon, you will probably discuss fairly with him whatever strikes you as objectionable in his prrt of the proceedings

(Signed) Yours very truly, H. B. STOWE.

4. *Letter of B. F. Butler, Esq., to Mr. Beecher.*

NEW YORK, Tuesday, Oct. 5, 1852.

DEAR SIR: I understand from you that, in a statement you are about to make in relation to the correspondence recently published in the newspapers, as having taken place between Rev. Dr. Parker and Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, you allude to the interview had between you and myself on the 10th of June, and say in respect of it: "To the card Mr. Butler objected, as wholly insufficient; to the correspondence he stated to me no particular objection, provided it was satisfactory to Dr. Parker." You request me to say whether the statement above quoted conforms to my recollection. Notwithstanding my professional relations to Dr. Parker, I conceive it to be my duty to answer this question; and I therefore state in reply to it that, so far as it goes, it is correct.

But it is due to myself to say that I did not dream of the publication of the correspondence until it should be first fully assented to, settled and signed by the respective parties; nor until after Dr. Parker, as to his part of it, should have had the opportunity of consulting with me as his counsel. This I supposed he would do, while you were taking measures to obtain, if you could, the assent of Mrs. Stowe, as to which, when at my office, you expressed some doubt. I have no recollection that you told me that Dr. Parker would consult me on the subject; but my expectation that he would do so was the necessary result of the relations of client and counsel existing between him and myself; and I therefore reserved for Dr. Parker's private consultation with me, my opinion and advice as to any question he might think it needful to propose to me, in regard to the final terms of the correspondence.

Will you do me the favour to publish this note with your statement? I am, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant, B. F. BUTLER.

Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, Brooklyn.

RECEPTION OF JOHN P. HALE.—In the report of the proceedings at the meeting of the Board of Aldermen on Monday evening, we observe that the use of the Governor's room was tendered to the Hon. John P. Hale, should he visit this city, as is proposed, on the 20th instant. As this body has taken the initiative, we do not see how the Free Democrats can avoid giving their candidate a public reception. Would not the Whigs pay that honour to Gen. Scott? or the Democrats to Gen. Pierce? And is not Mr. Hale as worthy of it as either of them?

Mr. Garrison is to pass through town to-day, but probably Alderman Sturtevant is not aware of it. However, we hardly expect it yet, but the time may come when we shall have the pleasure of showing him the way to the Governor's room—if we can find it.

The proceedings of the Aldermen in Mr. Hale's case are thus reported:

Alderman Sturtevant offered the following, which was strongly opposed by Alderman Barr, who remarked that he was surprised that one of the Board should offer a resolution to receive a man whose doctrines were so treasonable. Alderman Sturtevant said such respect as proposed was due to any of the United States' Senators, and especially to a candidate for the Presidency, no matter of what party. He was not favourable to Mr. Hale's doctrines, but thought Mr H. was an honest man, and, as he was a United States' Senator, and the candidate of his party for the Presidency, such respect and civilities were due. Aldermen Deman and Ward also spoke in favour of the resolution. Alderman Barr thought the proposed action would be disgraceful to the Common Council and city, and moved to lay the resolution on the table. This motion was lost, and the resolution was adopted by a vote of ten to three.

Whereas, It is understood that the Hon. John P. Hale, a distinguished Senator of the United States, who is a candidate for the highest office in the gift of the People, is expected to visit the city on or about the 20th inst., therefore be it

Resolved, If the Board of Assistant Aldermen concur, that the Mayor be requested to tender to the Hon. John P. Hale the use of the Governor's room in the City Hall, for the reception of his friends, at such time after his arrival as he may designate.

GENERAL SCOTT IN MEXICO.—General Scott, in one of his speeches on his recent tour through the Western States, made the following statement in relation to the offer which was made him to remain and become Dictator in that country. The Whigs may well make a trump card of it in the great game now playing:

"About two-fifths of all the branches of government, including nearly a majority of the members of Congress, and the Executive, were quite desirous of having that country annexed to ours. They knew that upon the ratification of the Treaty of Peace, nineteen out of twenty of the persons belonging to the American army would stand disbanded, and would be absolutely free from all obligations to remain in the army another moment. It was entirely true of all the new regiments called regulars, and eight out of ten of the rank and file of the old regiments. After the war was over, the government overwhelmed me with reinforcements, after there was no possibility of fighting another battle. When the war commenced, we had but one fourth the force which we needed. The Mexicans knew that the men in my army would be entitled to their discharge. They supposed if they could obtain my services I would retain these twelve or fifteen thousand men, and that I could easily obtain one hundred thousand more from home. The hope was, that it would immediately cause annexation. They offered me one million of dollars as a bonus, with a salary of $250,000 per annum, and five responsible individuals to become security in any bank in New York which I might name. It would be so arranged that I might get it in five days. They expected that annexation would be brought about in a few years, or, if not, that I could organize the finances, and straighten the complex affairs of that government. It was understood that nearly a majority of Congress was in favour of annexation, and that it was only necessary to publish a pronunciamento to that effect to secure the object. We possessed all the arms of the country, and occupied their cannon foundries and powder manufactories, had possession of their ports of entry, and might easily have held them in our possession if this arrangement had gone into effect. A published pronunciamento would have brought Congress right over to us, and with these fifteen thousand Americans holding the fortresses of the country, all Mexico could not have disturbed us We might have been there to this day if it had been necessary. I loved my distant home. I was not in favour of the annexation of Mexico to my country. Mexico has about eight millions of inhabitants, and out of these eight millions there are not more than one million who are of pure European blood. The Indians and mixed races constitute about seven millions. They are exceedingly inferior to our own. As a lover of my country, I was opposed to mixing up that race with our own. This was the first objection on my part to this proposition. May I plead some little love of home, which gave me the preference for the soil of my own country and its institutions? I came back to die under those institutions, and here I am"

THE POLITICIANS AND CUBA.—Public meetings have been held in this city during the past week, by both the prominent political parties, to express their indignation at the treatment which Mr Smith and the Ship Cornelia have received at the hands of the Governor General of Cuba. The Democrats resolved:

That this committee, representing the Democratic republican young men of the city and county of New York, feel for the cause of liberty all over the world, and detest tyranny and despotism wherever they may be found.

That we favour the strict maintenance of all treaty obligations, and regard any violation of them, on the part of an American citizen, as a violation of the faith he owes his government

That this government has never failed to fulfil all its treaty stipulations with the government of Spain, and that its conduct has been fair, honourable and conciliatory to the fullest, in all the delicate relations which the few past years have developed.

Therefore, That the recent outrages perpetrated upon American commerce, and the American flag, by the Spanish authorities of the island of Cuba, are accumulated to a wrong, demanding the immediate action of the government to vindicate the rights and dignity of the United States.

The Whigs are equally patriotic and equally zealous in the assertion of their love of liberty and hatred of tyranny (provided always, of course, it is out of the U. S.). Their resolutions are, in substance, the same as those of their opponents, with only this difference—that General Scott is the only statesman that can bring the difficulty to a happy conclusion.

PRESIDENTIAL PROSPECTS.—The results of the elections for various State offices in Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, being in favour of the Democrats, has given great satisfaction to that party, who claim it as virtually a settlement of the more important election in November. The Whigs, on the other hand, profess not to be discouraged by it, as they maintain that in all the recent elections, as they were comparatively unimportant, so their strength was not brought out, and that they shall be able to tell a very different story next month, when it shall be. It is unfortunate for the Whig party that it has a great many members who never *will* vote, and so permit it again and again to be defeated. Such incorrigible delinquents should be severely dealt with, and probably would be, if they could be found.

"UNCLE TOM" IN ENGLAND.—Mary Howitt, in a private letter to the editor of the *Tribune*, confirms the accounts which reach us from all quarters of the popularity of "Uncle Tom" in England. She says:

"Of course, you are aware of the wonderful excitement produced here by 'Uncle Tom's Cabin.' Everybody is reading it. Hundreds of thousands of copies are in circulation. My daughter saw a baker's boy sitting on his bread-cart in the street reading it. Masters and mistresses read it in the parlour, and their servants at the same time in the kitchen. High and low all read it. It is acted at our theatres, and some absurd person has even written a sequel to it, bringing (I believe) Uncle Tom alive into England."

## Foreign Correspondence.

FROM OUR DUBLIN CORRESPONDENT.

DUBLIN, October 1, 1852.

MY DEAR GAY: I send you by this mail the first number of the *Anti-Slavery Advocate*. It is, indeed, what poor N. P. Rogers used to call his *Herald of Freedom*—"a little sheet;" but if it gets plenty of nourishment and good treatment, I hope it will grow bigger, like many another baby. This paper has made its appearance at the right time, now that the British people are appalled as they have never been before, to the very bottom of their souls, by the horrors and enormities of American Slavery. It is often said by political writers in our newspapers that the people of Great Britain and the United States are virtually one nation; that their institutions and interests are very similar; and are daily becoming more identified. This is quite true; but the more frequent the intercourse, the more complete the identification, the more essential is it that the ingredients on both sides should be as free from any gross taint as possible. A large majority of the American travellers who swarm everywhere in these islands are imbued with the prevalent pro-slavery feelings of the successful American trader, minister, merchant, or politician. It is not the honest farmers and the high-minded Abolitionists who come. Their visits are few and far between. The Englishman is notoriously indifferent to the political or social arrangements of other countries, and is too apt to take on trust what the natives tell him; and if his religious sympathies or commercial interests correspond with those of his informants, he all the more readily believes what they say. This accounts for the easy faith given to those American tourists who say either that Slavery is nothing, or else paint it *couleur de rose*.

All this process of false intelligence has received a terribly damaging blow from the pen of Mrs. Stowe. The success of her book in England is perfectly wonderful. The number of copies of Uncle Tom's Cabin already printed in England cannot be much under 300,000, and I see no probability of the sale being diminished for some time to come. As far as my experience and observation go, no other work of fiction has *ever* had such immediate popularity in England—and none other ever deserved it so well, for none was prompted by such noble impulses or had such a beneficent object in view. If Daniel Webster has not gratified his own guilty ambition or secured his own miserable interests by achieving the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law, he has done a much better thing—he has raised up one universal shout of execration, wherever the English language is spoken, against his lordly patrons, the slaveholders, by forcing Mrs. Stowe to write her book. If the South are angry with Mrs. Stowe, they may thank Mr. Webster for putting the notion into her head. I make no question that in this one act he has done the world more service than by all the splendid eloquence that made an illustrious man of him, and glorified his earlier and better years. All the bribes lavished on him by his pro-slavery retainers in New York and Boston have thus cruelly recoiled on their own heads. Verily, the men of the South have called a Prophet out of the mountains of the East, to curse the Anti-Slavery Israel; and lo! the Balaam of Marshfield hath blessed them altogether—not by the words he hath spoken with his own lying lips, but by the mouth of another, a fair Prophetess who hath turned his curses into blessings.

The White Slave, in great variety of editions (one at least very elegant, and all very cheap), is to be seen in all the shops, beside "Uncle Tom." Many years since, I read "Archy Moore" with intense interest, and with all the zeal of a convert, for it was in my Anti-Slavery infancy. A few days ago, I devoured "The White Slave" at one reading—and it does not suffer by the comparison. Rather, it does not bear to be compared; it is so dissimilar, yet remarkably vigorous, racy and impressive. It has rare unity, though less dramatic interest than "Uncle Tom," with the compactness, continuity and power of Godwin's tremendous romances.

I should have told you it will be the special business of the *Anti-Slavery Advocate* to devote itself to the exposure of American Slavery, and of the policy and religious professions of the American people as far as they support their monstrous institution. If the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society had employed the funds at their disposal for this object with half the zeal with which they damaged the influence of the most zealous friends of the slave in the United States, we should not have to complain of the apathy of so many of the literary class amongst us; nor would American pro-slavery visitors have found it so easy to contaminate some of our principal organs of public opinion, such as *The Times*, with their own preposterous idea that the best friends of the man fallen among thieves are they who pass by on the other side. I confidently hope that England at least will soon grow too hot to hold those Ministers of Evil, unless they put on the cloak of hypocrisy, which they assume so readily, and take good care to declare that they are as much opposed to Slavery as anybody—omitting the usual *But*, with all its customary lying qualifications, which might have deceived poor, innocent, ignorant John Bull before. Yet *now*, they will be readily answered by pat quotations from the popular Anti-Slavery manuals with which the English people are so abundantly furnished. Wherever you go—at the Railway Stations, in the cars, on the tables of steamboats, in piles in the booksellers' windows—there you see them in flaming orange covers that I love to see.

What a grand and glorious speech is that of Horace Mann's—a perfect feast of good things. And to think of its being spoken in "the House" in the teeth of the assembled wisdom of the Southern Chivalry. Surely, you need not despair of your country, when Giddings, and Mann, and Sumner, can speak as they do in Washington. Garrison, Quincy and Phillips may feel fully assured that God has blessed their work. Things there are greatly changed since the imprisonment of poor Dr. Reuben Crandall. I am no great critic nor a very profound judge of such matters, but I know what I like—and one of the things I entirely relish is such a speech as that of Horace Mann's. It is fluent, ready, forcible, and feeling—just the eloquence that fills your eyes and makes your heart glow. Slavery cannot stand, we may be assured, before a free press, free speech, and the scorn of the civilised world. I am not unconscious that Mr. Mann's eloquent and admirable speech is miserably marred by that most impotent conclusion to which every American politician must come who has taken the oath to the Constitution and means to keep it. He is obliged to respect the compromises. He must respect State Rights. He has to assure the slave States, no matter how terribly he may expose their favourite institution, no matter how mercilessly he may hang up their doughfaced myrmidons to the world's infamy—on a gallows higher than Haman's—that still he wants nothing more from them than "hands off!" If they will keep within their own borders, he will leave them the free range of their blood-saturated soil, and full license to do as they like in their own baracoons. He seems as much afraid of a separation from the slaveholders as if they were the most respectable and invaluable of allies, and as if it were the special duty of the freemen of the North to protect them from the hostility they have earned by their cruelties and crimes. I have read somewhere of a tyrant who compelled his living victims to walk about with the carcasses of those he had murdered tied on their backs. Morally speaking, are not the Free States in a condition something like that of those poor wretches?

Have you seen Victor Hugo's "Napoleon the Little?" If not, buy it and read it before you are a day older. It is the most powerful political diatribe I have ever seen. It is amazingly eloquent, vivid and scathing. I never heard that anybody suspected Louis Napoleon of the possession of conscience, sensibility, or any generous emotion, and therefore I suppose this book will give him no shame and little anxiety. But how the French people can bear to be domineered over by such a ghoul—how they can cheer him, magnify him, and make a crowned emperor of him—I am utterly unable to comprehend.

The Duke of Wellington's death you have, of course, heard of. I do not know whether much interest is felt about him in the United States. In England, the manifestation of natural regret and respect have been almost unanimous. All that has been published of him is laudatory. He was undoubtedly animated throughout his career by a predominant sense of duty. He had no selfish ambition. He was no swaggerer—no hypocrite—no playactor. As far as a soldier can be, he was sparing of human life. His concession of Catholic emancipation was due rather to his humanity than his sense of its propriety or fitness. He was remarkably unostentatious, and charitable in secret—of which an instance came to light a few months ago, when it was found that he had given a great deal of money privately to persons in apparent distress, who appealed to him on false pretences. In every moral and political point of view, his character contrasts most favourably with that of Napoleon, who seems to have cared for nobody but himself. I will finish my letter with an anecdote about the Duke that I think quite beautiful. People are best judged by their little acts. "Straws show how the wind blows."

In the garden of Walmer Castle, the Duke, one day, saw a young boy, whom he recognised as belonging to the gardeners, busily engaged in some inscrutable occupation on the ground. The Duke went close, and looked, but still could not solve the mystery. "What are you about?" he asked, in his point-blank way. "It's a pet toad I 'm feeding," said the boy whimpering, "and they 're going to send me to school, and the toad will die." "Never mind; go to school," said the great captain; *"I'll* take care of the toad." And so he did The boy went to school; and subsequently he received a letter which reported the well-being of the toad, in the well-known autograph writing of "F. M. the Duke of Wellington." Is not that good?

Yours ever, RICHARD D. WEBB.

## Miscellaneous News.

*FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DUBLIN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.*

"THE Dublin Anti-Slavery Society, in preparing a Report of their Anniversary for the past year, are actuated more by a desire to interest others in the cause which engages their attention, than to make a parade of any efforts of their own, which, as may be naturally supposed, can produce little direct influence in removing the great evil of Slavery. Yet, by taking advantage of available opportunities for spreading information on the subject amongst our fellow-countrymen, and by holding out the encouraging hand of sympathy and help to those who, in other countries, are labouring for the emancipation of the slave, we hope our feeble exertions have not been altogether in vain.

"As many may not be acquainted with the reasons for the formation of our Society, we subjoin those which were drawn up at its commencement:

"'1st. That the system of chattel Slavery is incompatible with practical Christianity, and with the existence of civil, religious, or intellectual liberty, in the countries where it prevails.

"'2nd. That, notwithstanding upwards of sixty years of Anti-Slavery effort, the Slave Trade is still carried on—that Slavery still exists to a prodigious extent in the United States of America, in Brazil, Cuba, and elsewhere, and that, notwithstanding the abolition of Slavery in our own West India Colonies, a spirit of tyranny still prevails there, which it demands vigilant exertions to counteract.

"'3rd. That we are closely connected with the United States of America, by similarity of language, social institutions, and commercial interests; and as the intercourse between us is rapidly increasing, it is especially important that correct information respecting the extent, influence, and operation of Slavery, in that country, should be widely diffused among us.

"'4th That the policy of the Federal Government is so earnestly directed to the maintenance of Slavery, that one of the latest enactments of Congress—the Fugitive Slave Bill—has constituted the whole territory of the Republic into one vast human hunting ground; and provides that every citizen of the Union shall, under heavy penalties, assist, if called upon, in the apprehension of fugitive slaves.

"'5th. That at least one-eighth of the population of that country being slaves, to whom education and the marriage institution are forbidden, and the slaveholders themselves being shockingly corrupted by the tyranny, and the licentious habits induced by their position, a frightful amount of demoralization and practical heathenism, are the inevitable consequences.

"'6th. That the existence of such an institution in a professedly free and Christian country, must depend on the extent to which it can secure the silence or co-operation of religious bodies, and the support of public opinion.

"'7th. That throughout the whole American Union, the Anti-Slavery action of the religious bodies is in most cases paralyzed, and public opinion almost universally depraved, by pro-slavery influence.

"'8th. That we believe Slavery in *all countries*, and under *all circumstances*, to be an enormous moral and social evil, hostile to every good influence, and which should be opposed by every Christian means in our power.'

"These are the reasons which induced us to unite for the purpose of promoting the abolition of chattel Slavery throughout the world, by the diffusion of information respecting it amongst the people of Ireland, and by co-operating with those who are labouring for the same cause in other countries.

"In order more effectually to accomplish our objects, two Committees were formed, one composed of ladies, the other of gentlemen, who act independently of each other, and hold a joint monthly meeting to report progress, and for the interchange and communication of information.

"The support which American Slavery receives from the ministers of the various Christian denominations is notorious, and has become still more glaring since the adoption of the Fugitive Slave Law, which many of the more prominent among them defend, and even eulogize. Strongly impressed with these facts, the Ladies Committee circulated among clergymen of various denominations, in this city, a printed paper, containing the opinions of many of their American brethren on the subject of Slavery in that country, particularly as regards the recent Fugitive Slave Law; they also forwarded some copies to Belfast and Wexford.

"About the same time the Gentlemen's Committee prepared a short address for circulation amongst the emigrants, who leave our shores in such vast numbers, generally in ignorance of the existence of Slavery, or of its attendant evils in the land of their adoption. These were recommended to settle in all parts of the Union which are least tainted with Slavery, and to assist the slave, and his friends, when they had it in their power to do so. This address was widely circulated both in Dublin and in many parts of the country. It was also inserted in some of the provincial papers.

"In order to procure as large a contribution as possible to the Boston Anti-Slavery Bazaar, the Ladies' Committee issued a circular, stating its objects, and requesting contributions. This appeal was, in many cases, responded to; and after the articles were exhibited for a few days, previous to packing, a quantity, amounting in value to about 40*l.*, was forwarded to Boston.

"Professor Hancock having offered to deliver an address to the Anti-Slavery Society, on the best means of improving the condition of our West India possessions, by promoting education, and improving the legislation and administration of the laws, his proposal was thankfully accepted, and a special meeting was held for this purpose, which was fully attended, and the lecture, which was chiefly directed to the condition and prospects of the British West Indies, as respects their present ability to compete on fair terms with the slave labour of other countries, was full of interesting information and important views.

"The enactment of the Fugitive Slave Law (the cruel operations of which have been felt by many thousands during the past year) has raised the indignation of all who esteem right and justice. The influence of its powers, as carried out by its heartless supporters, has spread the gloom of fear and dismay over many a family circle, which enjoyed for years those common rights, which their Creator has bestowed upon all. Instances have occurred of fathers being torn from their children, and of mothers and children being hurried off to that condition of bondage, which is so often more terrible than death itself. Hundreds have fled to Canada, seeking there a home, which they were denied in the land of their birth. The Ladies' Committee have circulated many copies of the Fugitive Slave Bill, believing that our fellow-citizens had previously no idea of the extent of the wickedness of this odious enactment.

"As many of the fugitive slaves arrive in Canada, totally unprovided with necessaries for the support of life, and exposed to all the rigours of a Northern climate, they are, in many cases, liable to perish before they have tasted the joys of liberty and security. Their helpless condition engages the benevolent sympathy of some ladies in Toronto, who, in proportion to the means at their disposal, have done much to mitigate the sufferings of these poor people. A letter on this subject was received by the Ladies Committee, through the Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society, from Mrs. Dr. Willis, soliciting aid for this purpose. This appeal they responded to; and having introduced the subject into the joint monthly meeting, the Gentlemen's Committee appropriated 5*l.* of their funds for this object, which, added to a collection made by the ladies, amounting to 18*l.*, was forwarded to Canada, accompanied by the following address:

"'*To the Committee of the Ladies' Society, in Toronto, for relieving Coloured Refugees.*

"'The Committees of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Ladies' Anti-Slavery Societies, have forwarded to us a letter received by one of their members from Mrs. Dr. Willis, Toronto, appealing in behalf of your Society for a little aid to its funds, and giving a short sketch of your labours. We sympathize with you in your efforts, and difficulties, and have great pleasure in sending 23*l.* as a small offering to your treasury, of this sum 5*l.* were contributed by the Dublin Gentlemen's Anti-Slavery Committee, and the remainder was raised by a subscription amongst ourselves and friends, who take an interest in the welfare of the poor hunted fugitive. We have known something of being surrounded by suffering, which it is not in our power adequately to relieve, and can feel for you in the still more heart-rending cases which must come before you. The effects of the infamous Fugitive Slave Law are painfully familiar to us through the American Anti-slaving papers; but we are certain that no description can equal the actual witnessing of the suffering which it occasions.

"'We are fellow-labourers with you for the poor wronged coloured men, though in a different direction. Our Society seeks as far as its influence extends to lay the axe to the root of the corrupt tree of Slavery, whose fruit is so bitter; to extend the conviction of the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, and to convert a guilty nation to better thoughts, and better deeds, so that the coloured man may yet find a free and peaceful home in the land of his birth. May you meantime be encouraged to continue your labours of love, cheered by the good you are able to accomplish, and by the conviction that you have at least done what you could.

"'(Signed on behalf of the Dublin Ladies Anti-Slavery Society)

"'MARY EDMUNDSON, Secretary.'

"This brief sketch of the Dublin Anti-Slavery Society, reports the proceedings of the first year of its existence, during which many of us have been rather learners than workers, acquiring at our periodical meetings clearer views of the horrors and evils of Slavery, and deeper interest in the efforts which many noble-minded philanthropists are making for its overthrow.

"We invite the support and assistance of all in furthering the good cause, assuring those who do not yet feel that interest which the subject deserves, that they could hardly be engaged in a nobler work than assisting, however feebly, to free the slave from a brutalizing bondage, which not only crushes and degrades its victim, but is productive of grievous injury to the cause of religion, and constitutional liberty, throughout the world.

"In reviewing the history of Slavery for the past year, we see much to render it one of trial and gloom to the sufferers. In America the Slave Power has made renewed efforts to retain its darling institutions. The Fugitive Slave Law—enactments to prevent the settling of free coloured people in some of the free States, and other cruel and unjust laws have been the means adopted with this view.

"It is natural to suppose that as the wickedness of Slavery becomes more generally understood and condemned, so will the efforts of the slaveholder be exerted to retain his victim within his grasp.

"On the other hand it is gratifying to believe that the extent of the Slave Trade is diminished, though still retaining all its repulsive features

"The liberation of the slaves in the French West India Colonies, is an event of very recent occurrence, and although their liberty has been interfered with by the present French Government, yet they are not likely to be deprived of the freedom which has been granted them. It may be encouraging to those who, under a sense of great individual inability to cope with this giant evil, are labouring for its overthrow, to be informed that the abolition of Slavery in the French West India Islands was mainly owing to the presence of Victor Schoelcher, a representative from Guadaloupe, who was in Paris during the Revolution of 1848, and by his efforts and influence with Lamartine, and other members of the Government, procured the law which abolished French Colonial Slavery—an object for which the Abolitionists of France had hitherto been labouring apparently in vain.

"The free coloured population of our West India possessions, though labouring under many disadvantages, are advancing in comfort and intelligence, bearing ample testimony to the blessings of freedom, though trammelled by many unfavourable laws, and obliged to compete with the slave labour of Cuba, Porto Rico, and Brazil.

"Our attention has been frequently engaged in discussing the advantages likely to arise from the use of free labour produce, instead of that produced by slave labour, and we are informed, that from the British East Indies alone this article might be obtained in quantity sufficient for the wants of the English manufacturers. We, therefore, look with interest on the development of its cultivation in that country, and sincerely hope that, at the renewal of the East India Company's charter, in 1854, every obstacle may be removed which now checks its more general introduction in the East.

"It will be seen that the subject of the abolition of Slavery, like every other great moral question, embraces many points of deep interest. The existence of Slavery is opposed to all that is true and noble in our nature, and is directly contrary to the spirit and teachings of Christianity, debasing and degrading the slave, corrupting and demoralizing the master. Let us then exert whatever influence we possess in endeavouring to undermine an institution which perpetuates all the powers of evil, and stifles all the influences of good.

"(Signed)

"RICHARD D. WEBB,
"WILLIAM FISHER, } Secretaries."

NO MORE BEGGING FOR FARMS OR CLOTHES FOR FUGITIVES IN CANADA.—A meeting of the coloured citizens of Windsor (Canada West), and vicinity, was held in the barracks in that place, on the evening of September 27, to inquire into the grievances of fugitives, against almoners of donations received from the United States; and to take measures to put an end, if possible, to the *begging system* so far as it can apply to them.

Mr. Peter Poyntz was called to the Chair, and Elisha Robinson and Mary A. Shadd were appointed Secretaries.

Mr. Thomas Jones then presented the following preamble and resolutions, which, after full discussion—Messrs. Jones, Reynolds, Williams and others in favour, and Messrs. Bibb, Holley, Mrs. Bibb, and a gentleman (name unknown), against—were unanimously adopted.

Whereas, we live in a country in which equal rights are enjoyed by men without regard to complexion, and in which, men who are willing to work can thereby get ample means of support; and

Whereas, there are systematized and extensive movements now being recommended to the philanthropic in the United States and elsewhere, purporting to be necessary because of the ignorance and destitution existing among us (principally refugees from American Slavery, now loyal subjects of Her Majesty's Government), thus holding us up before the world as a class of improvident, thriftless and imbecile paupers; therefore,

1. Resolved, That we have reason to thank God for the impartial character and administration of the laws of this our adopted country, and for the easy conditions offered to us, in common with other settlers, to appropriate the soil to our comfort and support.

2. Resolved, That we desire only our true character of responsible men, willing and determined to support ourselves; and determined to oppose, to the extent of our ability, the practice of begging for farms, clothes, &c., for us.

3. Resolved, That in common with Christians everywhere, we would, when expressing hostility to begging, discriminate in favour of begging for gospel and educational purposes; but should friends persist in raising funds in our name, for other than the purposes above-mentioned, we hope it will be to aid those noble Abolitionists who have been despoiled by the courts of the United States, for helping fugitives to a land of liberty.

4. Resolved, That we do not regard the "Refugees' Home Society" as a benevolent institution, designed to benefit a formerly down-trodden people, but as an exceedingly cunning land scheme, the continuance of which, by giving fresh impulse and a specious character to the begging system, will materially compromise our manhood, by representing us as objects of charity, injure seriously the character of this country, and tend to the pecuniary advantage of its agents, and theirs only.

5. Resolved, That though we sincerely thank those who have, from time to time, sent money and clothes to help the escaped fugitive from American Slavery, and support him till he can get work, we should advise them to discontinue such aid in our behalf, as we seldom get clothes or money from many of those with whom they are deposited.

Voted, That the proceedings of this meeting be sent to the *Globe*, in Canada, and to the Anti-Slavery papers in the United States.

On motion, the meeting adjourned.

PETER POYNTZ, *President.*

ELISHA ROBINSON,
MARY A. SHADD, } *Secretaries.*

A SUPPOSED KIDNAPPING CASE.—Yesterday morning two individuals called on Mr. John N. Denning, and offered to sell him a likely coloured boy, aged about fourteen years, and calling himself John Henry Wilson, stating their willingness to dispose of him for five hundred dollars. Mr. Denning refused to buy him at the time, and he was again called on by one of the party an hour or two afterwards, who offered to take two hundred dollars for the black. The proposition very naturally awakened Mr. Denning's suspicions that all was not right, so he held the party in suspense until Messrs. Potee, Graham and McKinley were fully informed of all the particulars. They promptly acted upon their information and soon arrested the party last mentioned, who gave his name as William Kelly. He seems to be deaf and dumb, as he has not spoken a single word, and appears not to understand all that is said upon the subject. The

# Miscellaneous Department.

## JAPAN

CHARACTER OF THE COUNTRY—RELATIONS WITH THE WORLD—THE UNITED STATES EXPEDITION.

A COUNTRY which, in these days of free trade and reciprocity, shuts its ports against the commerce of the world, and not only prohibits the advent of foreigners, but in case any of its own inhabitants have been so unfortunate as to visit other lands, refuses to acknowledge their claims to re-admission, is in itself a curiosity. There can be no doubt that an individual, who chooses to isolate himself from the rest of the world, may do so as long as he pleases with perfect impunity. No one troubles himself mush about the matter. He is thought a strange fish, and his neighbours pass on their way rejoicing, and regard him not. But whether a whole country, which covers an area of nearly 100,000 square miles with a population estimated at about 30,000,000, can be permitted to follow such an example is another question. Such has hitherto been the conduct of Japan, although situated directly opposite the American possessions, and consisting of a coast more extensive than the whole Atlantic shore of the United States, with hundreds of whalers passing by every year. She not only refuses the least assistance in any case of emergency, but if any valuable vessels is cast upon her inhospitable shore, seizes upon the crews, tortures and murders them, and has even gone so far as to exhibit them shut up in cages, as a warning spectacle to deter others from making even an attempt to land.

Such a country presents a strange spectacle in the progress of civilization; how long such a condition of affairs shall be permitted to continue depends upon the result of the American expedition, which has been fitted out for the purpose of making the Japanese "listen to reason." At one period, within the course of the last twelve months, there were not fewer than 120 American whalers at anchor in the Sandwich Islands, a considerable distance from the scene of their operations, for no other reason than an apprehension of the consequences if they ventured to enter any of the neighbouring and more convenient ports of Japan.

The Island of Japan are of volcanic origin. They form no inconsiderable portion of the line which extends from Kamtschatka to the Malay Archipelago. They are situated between the latitude of thirty degrees, and about forty north. The climate is variable, and nature has been very lavish of her gifts in regard to this favoured land. But the inhabitants appear to have a singular determination that no stranger shall participate in the advantages they enjoy. The principle of reciprocity is totally unknown to them. Not free trade only, but trade in all its branches, they entirely repudiate. They will have no dealings with their neighbours, and even the blandishments of the Emperor of China have failed to win them from their reserve. There exists only one nation on the face of the globe whom they will ever admit upon their inhospitable shores, and even this intercourse is restricted. Two Dutch ships are admitted every year, but under conditions so degrading that it cannot but be a matter of surprise any civilized European people will submit to them. At one period, its commercial policy was most liberal, at least as much so as that of other nations. The restrictive system has been the result of the conduct of certain Portuguese Jesuits towards the end of the sixteenth and commencement of the seventeenth century. About this period, England had a trade with Japan, but since the restriction was imposed, the enactment has been so rigid that all further attempts to reestablish commercial relations have proved entirely unsuccessful.

The increase of the Whale trade in the Pacific has resulted in the collision between the Americans and the Government of Japan, the issue of which remains to be determined. But in the natural course of human events, the traffic which now exists between California and Hong-Kong must sooner or later result in the reestablishment of commercial relations with this extraordinary people.

The first attempt made by the United States to open negotiations with Japan took place about six years ago; a ninety-gun ship, attended by a frigate, cast anchor in the Bay of Jedo. They were immediately surrounded by nearly four hundred boats, crowded with armed natives; ono of them boarded the *Vincennes* but there was no collision. The first move having the semblance of hostility, made by them, was to cut off, by a triple line of boats, the communication between the American vessels; but being foiled in this attempt, they tried nothing further. During the fortnight that the ships remained in the harbour, no one was allowed to land. A representation made to the Emperor was promptly met by the reply, that *Japan never would establish commercial relations with any other country than Holland.* Finding all attempts to open negotiations rendered thus abortive, the American captain weighed anchor, the fleet of boats, which had been watching his operations, escorting him by the way of convoy. A couple of years ago some American seamen having been wrecked upon the coast, a ship was dispatched to fetch them away. But no sooner had it appeared in the harbour of Jedo, than a formidable array of the striped canvas batteries covered the hills. The American continued her course, until a boat came alongside with an interpreter, who, unfolding his chart, pointed out the precise locality where it was necessary the ship should anchor. Some natives then boarded her; but the American captain not being satisfied with their appearance, refused to hold any communication with them, insisting that they were not of the proper rank. A mandarin then arrived, and with him the negotiations were conducted to a satisfactory issue.

With such a people, the only course likely to be attended with success, is energetic promptness; implicit submission will not do. A spectator describes the species of homage by which the Dutch have purchased their commercial privileges. The representative of the country crawled on his hands and knees to a spot shown him, between the presents, ranged in due order on one side, and the place where the Emperor was seated on the other; and thus kneeling, he bowed his forehead quite down to the ground, and so crawled backwards like a crab, without uttering a single word.

When the entire circumference of the earth can be traversed by steam, as will be the case when a Railroad across the Isthmus of Suez connects the Mediterranean with the Indian Seas, and the Atlantic is joined to the Pacific by a similar communication upon the west, it will, one would suppose, no longer be possible for these countries to continue the restraint they have imposed upon them. With the civilization of Europe and America thundering at their very doors, they cannot, surely, refuse admittance to the tide. They will not continue to do so, we should think, when it is made manifest that the result will be advantageous of themselves. Thousands of Chinese have found their way to California, and are among the most thrifty and industrious of the colonists in the New World. The tidings of their success will not be without its ameliorating effect upon the Japanese. What their military resources may be, we have, of course, no direct means of ascertaining; but when we consider they have never had any foreign wars, save in the case of China, and that, as far as we know, their Government has always carried on on the pacific system, there cannot be much doubt that they will fall an easy prey to the first attack made upon their shores by any powerful civilized nation.

The country known by the name of Japan, consists of three islands equal in extent to England, being to the east of China. It thence obtained the appellation of Jepun ("Source of Day"), which, in our vernacular, has been altered into Japan. The chief of these islands are Niphon, Kewsew, and Sikof.

The climate, although healthy, differs materially from that of other countries situated in the same latitude. In Jeddo, the chief town, which lies in the thirty-sixth degree, there is not unfrequently both frost and snow. The difference of climate, perhaps, proceeds from local causes. The Japanese Islands are separated from Asia by a strait of considerable extent, and the country of the Mantebans and Tartary, which form the eastern boundary of Asia, consists of immense desert full of lakes and mountains; from these come cold winds, which bring fogs, that continue not unfrequently several days in succession. To these causes may, in some degree, be attributed the difference of temperature between this country and those situated in the same parallels. The cold is often fifteen degrees of Reaumur. In Summer those portions of Europe of the same latitude enjoy the finest and most serene weather, while in Japan the rain falls in torrents, the horizon is dark with clouds, strong winds blow, and there is a constant and dense fog. The causes which we have mentioned may be sufficient to explain this striking phenomenon, which, in any account of the country, deserves to be recorded.

The Government of these Islands is singularly constituted. Before the Christian era there was one king, who, like his brother of China, claimed to be of celestial origin. In all matters, not of temporal only, but of spiritual jurisdiction, his will was absolute. He was both King and Pope. About one hundred years, however, before the introduction of Christianity, a bill was brought in for separating these functions, and the office was split in two. There were now, therefore, a spiritual as well as a secular king; the former, whom they delight to surround with all the externals of royalty, resides at Miako; the latter at Jeddo. Besides these plenipotentiaries, there is a race of hereditary princes, who wield a species of feudal power in their respective dominions, each of them, in his degree, acting more or less as a restraining power upon the king, who, with every external system of absolute authority, is, in reality, surrounded by a system of espionage which renders it impossible for him to commit any act of an independent nature.

The Japanese are divided into eight separate classes. Princes, nobles, priests, soldiers, merchants, mechanics, peasants and slaves. The dignity of the prince is hereditary, descending from father to son, unless some disqualification exists, in which case the rule is broken through. The privileges appertaining to this rank are numerous, often extending to the most minute particulars. The whole population of these Islands has a more or less military tendency. Every Japanese of any distinction is obliged to have some knowledge of the art of war; and the office of the soldier, like that of the noble, being hereditary, the class is distinct and separate; age forms no disqualification. The soldier must serve until his son is able to supply his place; fifteen is the age at which they can enter. The service has many advantages, their pay is good, the dress splendid, and the rations excellent. The arms are a sabre and dagger, and to be cashiered is considered the greatest punishment that can be inflicted.

Every soldier upon entering the profession of arms is obliged to take an oath of fidelity to the Emperor, which he signs with his own blood. The military force consists of artillery, infantry, and cavalry; the latter are splendidly equipped with rich dresses and fine horses. The cannon are made of copper, thick in proportion to the calibre, and the necessity of unscrewing the breech in order to load, makes the service of this arm, of course, slow: none of their guns are of weighty metal; the largest being some eighteen and twenty-four pounders of Dutch manufacture. Their gunpowder they manufacture themselves. Their infantry are armed with arrows, pikes, and muskets, the barrels of which are made of the same metal as their cannon. The butt-ends are small, and matchlocks are used instead of flints; these people are consequently very far indeed behind the age in the use of such weapons, but in the management of the pike and arrow, they evince considerable dexterity.

The undress uniform of a common soldier consists of a short cloak which is worn over their clothes. Those in the service of the Emperor are distinguished by white embroidery. The state uniform, worn only upon grand occasions, is very gorgeous, so much so that by the few travellers who have visited this country, a common soldier has not unfrequently been mistaken for a person of high rank. It consists of white trousers, a short upper garment, like a cloak, embroidered with silk and gold. Their trousers are short and wide, and their breasts are protected by armour. They wear hats of lacquered metal, with visor to protect the face. Upon the whole, encumbered as they are, the military force of these Islands is by no means calculated for active warfare; their pay is received not in specie, but in rice, which they convert into money. They have no permanent offices of rank. If occasion demands, the Emperor selects the principal commanders, the others are nominated by the princes, as is the custom in Russia. In the science of engineering, the Japanese are not more experienced than in the other branches of military art. Their batteries and fortresses are rudely constructed, in a mode which shows they are but little versed in the rules of modern fortification. Their batteries, which command the entrance of the chief harbours, are mounted by cannon of a small calibre; nor are they much better furnished with the means of maratime defence. They had formerly a fleet, and although the ships were capacious, and large enough to contain a large number of soldiers, they were cumbrous and unweildy. One large mast, with a sail of corresponding magnitude, formed their only rigging. The navy now exists no longer, and even merchant vessels are, by the orders of the Emperor, forbidden to carry arms. The deficiency in regard to their means of maritime warfare might be supplied without much difficulty. Their ports are good, and they have materials for ship building in abundance. The people, says an intelligent and shrewd observer, are quick of comprehension, and ready at learning. Japanese mariners trained in the European manner, would soon make the fleets of Japan able to contend with those of Europe. It requires no little courage to put to sea in such vessels as they now have. It a storm drives them from the coast, the rudder and mast break, and the vessel is then exposed to the mercy of the wind and waves. The winds prevalent in these seas, blow either from the Japanese coast or in a direction parallel to it. In these desperate cases, therefore, mariners can only either perish at sea, or to be wrecked on a strange coast. If any one escapes, he can hardly hope to see his native country again, as no other has any intercourse with it. In this manner Japanese ships have been washed on the coast of Kamtschatka, and on the Aleutian and Kurile Islands, and it is not improbable that many more have perished at sea. It is wonderful with what dexterity the Japanese manage their great boats in the violent surf and in the most rapid currents at the mouths of rivers, when the effects of ebb and flood are greatest; from such sailors everything may be expected.

Although the government of this strange country cannot be called tyrannical, the laws are unquestionably severe. Torture is empioyed to extract confession, and corporal punishment is used for the most trifling offences. A Russian gentleman, who was for so ne time detained a prisoner in these islands, relates the fact of his having been called up before the judges to undergo examination. He was ushered into a large hall or rather shed, where these functionaries held their court, seated upon an elevated platform at the end of a long table. At the further extremity of this building was a row of posts. While the Russian was undergoing his examination, a Japanese, who had been confined in the same prison with himself, was fetched in with his hands bound. Some words were then pronounced by one of the judges, and a long, loose robe, which was the offender's only dress, was rolled up and twisted round his head so as to conceal his features, and, probably, muffle his cries. He was then bound hand and foot to one of the posts, and flogged with great severity. The Russian being removed before the sentence was completed, had no opportunity of ascertaining the extent of the punishment. But the man was brought back to the prison with his back much lacerated; and the surgeons proceeded to cure his wounds by spitting on their hands and rubbing the saliva into them. A mode of torture in common use to extract confessions, is worth mentioning, as a hint to the Inquisition of the day. The accused is placed upon his bare knees upon a very blunt sabre, or bar of iron; stones are then hung upon him, so that in proportion as the weight is augmented, his suffering are increased. The *lex talionis* is permitted. A man who takes his wife in adultery, may put her and her paramour to death on the spot. A father may deal in like manner with the seducer of his daughter, and has a power over his offspring almost unlimited. The women seldom marry before their fifteenth year; and although the Benedict can have only one wife, he may have as many mistresses as he pleases. The bride's teeth are blackened with some corrosive liquid which is indelible. It can therefore be ascertained by a look at a lady's mouth, whether she has ever been led to the hymeneal altar, which saves a world of trouble.

The birth of every male child is celebrated by the planting of a tree, which, when it attains full growth, serves as a token that the man is marriageable. When this event takes place, the tree is cut down, and out of the wood is manufactured various household articles, useful for the *menage* of the young couple. Jealousy is a failing among these people. They keep a sharper look-out after their better halves than they do in England. The nobility and richer classes keep them for the most part confined to their rooms, to which no visitors of the male sex, except their nearest relatives are permitted to enter. Women of the lower classes are allowed to go about as much as they please, and to appear in the streets with their faces unveiled. Although sufficiently watchful, the jealousy of they Japanese is not by any means so great as that of many other Asiatic nations.

Their buildings are simple, being for the most part constructed altogether of wood. Stone is used for a foundation: but the violent earthquakes to which these countries are liable, render the Japanese cautious of erecting any edifice, the demolition of which might be attended with mischief. The houses are of slight construction, and seldom more than a single story in height. The partitions which divide the rooms are moveable, so that the whole house may be formed at will into a single apartment.

They use little or no furniture; the floor is covered by a mat, and the fire is burned in a small chafing dish. Arms of various descriptions, porcelain vessels, and curiosities of various kinds decorate the walls, which are covered with coloured and gold paper, or inlaid with carved wood. The only external difference between the houses of the superior classes and those of the lower orders—besides the size—is, that the former usually stand in court-yards and are surrounded by gardens. Of their towns little can be boasted in regard of architectural beauty. The streets are narrow, and the houses closely crowded together, without much eye to the picturesque.

Peace and order are maintained among the inhabitants by a species of town police, who are selected from the inhabitants of each street. In the public market-places, and at the points where the streets meet, guard-houses are established in which are placed fire-engines, ready in case of emergency. A body of men, regularly drilled and exercised, is kept in constant readiness, and forms an efficient corps of firemen. In the capital their number amounts to no less than forty thousand. These firemen are divided into regular regiments, each of which is marked by a letter of the alphabet. After nightfall no lights are permitted, nor is any one allowed to walk the streets with even a lantern.

The dress of a Japanese is singular. It resembles a loose *robe de chambre*, without any collar. The sleeves reach below the elbow, and are of great width. Occasionally five or six of these garments are worn, each on the top of the other, fastened round the waist by a girdle. The material of the dress worn by the lower classes in hemp or cotton. The rich indulge in silk. When one of these gentry finds a room too warm, he pulls off his upper gown, and lets it hang down his back like the pelisse of a woman. They wear no shirts. The fair six indulge in a variety even still greater. They have as many as twenty dresses, each over the other. They are fastened at the waist in the same way as those of the men, but are manufactured of the finest stuff. Neither sex, except upon the very grandest occasions, wear trousers. In the shape and fashion of this garment they then exhibit the greatest extravagance. It is wide—so wide that it resembles a bag, and remarkable for the grotesque variety of colour. Lilac, blue, green, and scarlet, are favourite hues; but the upper garment of a well-dressed Japanese is invariably black.

The shoe is a wonderful invention. The soles are made of straw, or thin slips of wood; from one side of the sole to the other there is a band of the same straw which separates the toes. Their travelling shoes are made of a similar material, only somewhat stronger. They wear neither hats nor gloves; and except in very rainy or very hot weather their heads are entirely uncovered, when they protect them with the fan. This appendage when not in use is stuck into the girdle, where they carry also ink with materials for writing, as well as a variety of medicines. No inhabitant of this country ever goes forth unprovided with an abundant stock of these, although from their extremely temperate habits one would suppose they would not have much occasion for the exercise of the healing art. Their food for the most part consists of rice, fish, fruit, herbs, and vegetables of various kinds—meat it not much eaten; some religious sects will not touch it; others partake freely of the flesh of hares, deer, and other wild animals; but upon the whole they are very abstemious, and the only luxury—it it can be called one—in which they are fond of indulging is the variety of their servants, and a number of equipages. The princes and men of high rank use carriages resembling those formerly used by the Dutch. They ride, too, on horseback; but it is considered *mauvais ton* for the rider to hold his own bridle—an attendant leads the horse.

Among the modes of punishment resorted to by these extraordinary natives, that of shutting the offender in a cage is not the least singular. These domiciles are about six paces in length, five in breadth, and vary to the height of ten feet. Through the railings of these the prisoners are handed their food, and are visited every half-hour by guards, in order to prevent them from falling asleep. Their day is divided into twelve hours, six from sunrise to sunset, and a similar number from sunset to sunrise; it consequently follows, therefore, that when the day is longer than the night, the day is longest; and when the night is longer than the day, the night follows the like rule.

When we come to examine dispassionately the character of this singular people, we find it distinguished by many virtues which nations in a higher degree of civilization would do well to copy. They are temperate, frugal and honest; to be found intoxicated is considered one of the most disgraceful acts of which a Japanese can be guilty; and although, at first sight, there may appear something discreditable in the seclusion which they appear determined to preserve, yet when we consider the fearful exercises committed under the garb of Christianity by the only Europeans with whom they have come in contact, upon a peaceful and harmless people, it can scarcely afford much ground for surprise that they should determine, in justice, to exclude from their shores all strangers, whom their past experience had taught them only visited them for the purpose of marring their repose, and disturbing the peaceful character of their Government.

With respect to education, these islanders are perhaps the most enlightened people in the world. Almost every one knows how to read and write, and is perfectly familiar with the laws of his country, in which the means of informing himself are supplied by large tables placed in public places in the principal towns and villages. In agriculture, horticulture, manufacture of silks, porcelain, and that description of ware which takes its name from their country, the Japanese are pre-eminently skilful; although much knowledge upon the condition or political arrangement of other countries is not encouraged, lest it should render them discontented with their own. They are not uninformed of the modern history of European countries. The Government, obtaining by means of the Chinese and Dutch, information respecting the political events in Europe; the Russian settlements in America, and the preponderance of the English in India, are to them a great source of uneasiness.

Notwithstanding all the pains that were taken to make them convinced of the pacific intentions of the Russian Government, they were greatly apprehensive upon the subject, which, perhaps, was in some degree confirmed by an ancient tradition among them, that from the North there would, in the process of time, come a people who would subdue Japan.

Their language, like themselves, is peculiar. It is not that of any other nation, but seems to be derived from a common origin with the Chinese. Their method of writing is by the use of symbols: their alphabet consists of forth-eight letters, many of which are syllabic.

We must now take our leave of these strange countries, with their dusky inhabitants, among whom we have so long lingered, with a curiosity the greater as their condition will, in all probability, undergo a speedy alteration. Whether the American expedition which has sailed against it is fitted out upon a scale calculated to insure success, we have no means of ascertaining; but there can be little doubt that *the energy of Brother Jonathan, unrestrained as it is likely, to be by manly scruples, may accomplish the entire subjugation of Japan.* What he will do with the country when he gets it as a problem which remains yet to be solved. The climate, the volcanoes, the earthquakes, and the other interesting phenomena we have endeavoured to describe, are not likely to be suitable to the American constitution. Be this as it may, great and wondrous changes must happen before very long. When the Burmese Empire is annexed to our own dominions, Japan will be situated between two formidable opponents, before either of which she must eventually give way. Thus it must ever be when the Saxon comes into collision with the Asiastic. The West is being emptied into the East; and the East, through the Chinese emigration, into the West. India is in our hands with her Eastern Archipelago, and the pacific subjugation of China has more than commenced already. There is the vast and fertile tract of Australia. How, as the gigantic vision opens upon our view, gorgeously looms in the distance a brilliant future. We can imagine the natives of that great Continent which has so recently fallen under our notice, habituated as they are to a temperature between the East and our own, ready to pour their superfluous hands into the new countries which shall fall beneath their sway. With free institutions, and inheriting the strong hands and iron energies of their Anglo-Saxon forefathers, what a nation may there one day spring into existence. Aided as they will be by the mighty agency of steam, it would be vain to speculate upon the limits or the progress of that splendid future. Years may pass away before our anticipations are realized, and the present generation be long forgotten; but in those countries lie the germ of mighty nations, which, when the land that sent them forth as Colonists shall have lost the prestige of her renown, will flourish great and free, the envy and admiration of the worn-out world.—*United States Mag.*

WHAT I HAVE NOTICED.—I have noticed that all men speak well of all men's virtues when they are dead, and that their tombstones are marked with the epitaphs of "good and virtuous." Is there any particular cemetery where the bad men are buried?

Never open the door to a little vice lest a great sin should enter also.

## RECOIL OF WAR UPON POLITICIANS.

THE cause of Peace, common to all good men, intermeddles with no struggles or schemes of individuals or parties for office and power; but it must, if true to its high purpose, seize on passing as well as on past events to instil into the community lessons of warning and wisdom. One of these is the suicidal folly of civilians abetting war, or a fondness for it, among the people. The latter are the chief sufferers from war, while politicians, as its real authors and abettors, expect from it popularity, emolument and power. More or less of these they must of course gain during its progress; but it is marvellous that they have not learned how it ultimately recoils on themselves, and snatches its highest prizes from their grasp. War takes the lion's shares of its political as well as its other spoils. It is a brutal tyrant; and statesmen of the ripest experience, and loftiest abilities, "it throws into the shade, or chains to its car, or crushes beneath the iron hoof. If you cultivate the arts of peace, then will talent, knowledge and wisdom hold the reins of government; but let the people become warlike, and military chieftains will soon drive them at all the point of the bayonet. Review the history of Greece and Rome, of England under Cromwell, of France under Napoleon, of all the republics except our own in the New World; and you will find this point a superabundance of proof. It is amazing that intellectual men should eulogize warriors, and still more strange the encouragement which statesmen lend to war; for they are thus cherishing a serpent that will one day wreath his folds around themselves, and strangle them to death. It is only in peace that their worth can be fully appreciated, or their merits duly rewarded; while in war, or under its influence even in peace, Pompey outpeers Cicero, Cromwell takes precedence of Milton, and the hero of New Orleans or Tippecanoe, with only a modicum of talent or knowledge, leaves the first minds of the land far behind them in the race of popularity and power."

Our own history is full of warnings on this point. "When politicians bring on war," says a neutral in politics, "they must pay the penalty. In republics, if civilians wish to retain their just influence as statesmen, they must preserve peace. War always has given, and always give, in our own and in every free country, ascendancy to military reputation. Snatching the prizes of political ambition from the politician, it will carry the successful General to his seats of power. In 1848, some of the politicians who pushed this country into the war of 1812, still live to brood over the fact, that the war raised up military chieftains who clutched from their grasp the Presidential crown, which otherwise would have encircled their brows in sure succession. It is a most instructive circumstance in our history, that when James Madison, then at the head of the government, manifested a reluctance to favour a declaration of war with England, a committee of three was despatched from a republican caucus to communicate to him the determination of that party to insist upon the measure. The experienced wisdom of that great statesman was overruled, and constrained by the short-sighted zeal of less wary politicians. Of that caucus Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun were the master spirits, and of that committee they were members. Although quite young men, they had, by their genius and eloquence, even then acquired the greatest degree of popularity that can be attained in the sphere of statesman. The whole nation was waiting, with admiring eagerness, to confer upon them, one after the other, its highest honour. They had their way, and war was declared. When the revolutionary series of Presidents was brought to a close, on the retirement of James Munroe, General Jackson, the hero of New Orleans, took from Mr. Clay so many of the electoral votes of the votes of the West, and from Mr. Calhoun so many of the votes of the South and Middle States, as to leave them both distanced in the race. The popularity of Jackson yielded only to that of General Harrison, the hero of Tippecanoe; and a fresh crop of military chieftans has just been reared to destroy, in all probability, the last chance of these veteran aspirants for the great prize. It is not the least of the eminent services they have rendered their country, that in their baffled ambition, the distinguished statesmen and truly great men whom we have named, teach to all coming times the salutary lesson, that, if politicians will have war, they must step aside for ever from the path of honour, and relinquish the posts of power to overshadowing rivals created by their own suicidal hands. It is not unlikely, as just intimated, that the lesson will be corroborated by the political results of the war in which the country is now involved. Let us hope that it may make a deep and durable impression upon that class of persons whom it so vitally concerns. When the leaders of parties become convinced, that in promoting warlike measures and a military spirit, they are digging their own graves, we confidently rely upon perpetual peace."*

This prediction is now fulfilled. The war did actually dig the political grave of its authors and chief abettors. The very President who began it, was denied the compliment even of a solitary vote for his re-nomination; the body-guard of his supporters were nearly all dropped from public service, and the whole party overwhelmed with a defeat that has no parallel in our history. A most salutary warning to politicians; and every true patriot must earnestly desire that it may be duly heeded in future.

But this is not all. The Mexican war drifted back upon a shoal of candidates for all sorts of office. Before its close, nearly every one of its prominent generals was nominated by somebody even for the presidency itself;† not a few of them, like Generals Kearney and Shields, were soon after appointed to high civil offices;‡ a multitude of them, especially at the West and South-west, have been selected for seats in Congress, and their respective State Legislatures; and, to cap the climax, a man, little known to the country a single year before that war, and never dreamed of for any service beyond the army, had no sooner fought the battle of Palo Alto, though a mere skirmish hardly worth a passing paragraph in the history of such a warrior as Napoleon, that the popular war-spirit, even in advance of all party calculation, proclaimed him at once as "the *people's* candidate for the presidency." We are not now sitting in judgment on the man himself; we are only observing how he rose to power. Nobody could blame him for this sudden outburst of popularity, nor have we the slightest wish to disparge him or his friends; we merely say that war alone made him President of these United States. Doubtless, his subsequent reputation for talent, integrity, independence, and other estimable qualities, may have won votes for him; but, beyond a doubt, it was solely his popularity as a general, though acquired in a war odious to the mass of his own supporters, that procured his *nomunation* for the high office he ultimately reached. Thus the mere warrior again eclipsed all the great political luminaries of the republic, and threw into practical contempt its great statesmen who had grown grey in its service as civilians, and shed over it the undying lustre of their genius, eloquence and wisdom.

It is painful to dwell on such facts; but we cannot quit this theme without alluding, in the very strong language of another, to the continued influence of the Mexican war in selecting candidates for Presidency: "From another point of the compass a similar moral may be drawn for future Presidential aspirants. Neither the Democratic party, nor its Northern leaders, had anything to gain by the Mexican war; and yet they plunged headlong into it at the dictation of the South. The Whig party, as such, always pronounced the war itself to be an aggression, and its territorial acquisitionss a robbery. Yet the great body of this party voted the supplies that ratified its inception. Opposition to the war of 1812 had proved politically disastrous to many of those who made it; and it was foreseen that opposition to the Mexican war might be attended with similar results. Hence the lukewarmness of Whig opposition in Congress, and hence the voting of supplies to carry it on. Hence the pro-slavery men, and the 'manifest destiny' men, were allowed to have their way; and so the war was continued at an estimated expenditure in the whole of more than $200,000,000, and the ultimate acquisition of territory, some portion of which is already occupied by slaves, and two-thirds of which is laid open to Slavery by law.

And now, what has been the effect of that war upon both the Democratic and Whig civilians, who either vigorously sustained it, or opposed to it only a feeble resistance? It made the Cæsars who have come back to rule over Rome. But for the Mexican war, General Taylor would have remained a 'frontier colonel,' as Mr. Webster sneeringly called him, and not even lunacy would have conceived of him for President. But for the Mexican war, General Scott, though in honour and in bravery retaining his invincibility, would have lacked, to political wooers, the more potent charm of availability, and would never have been nominated. And but for the Mexican War, the shades of oblivion would soon have perfected their easy work of hiding the name of General Pierce from the world forever. And now, behold the civilians, Cass, Buchanan, Marcy, and the rest, who stood sponsors and godfathers for that bloody deed! Defeated in 1848 by the very man whom the war they supported had raised up! Gen. Taylor discomfited only one Santa Anna in Mexico, but half a dozen at home. Look, too, at Mr. Webster, whose giant blows, had they been struck at the fitting time, might have broken the helmet and pierced the mailed armour of that Mars; yet see him thrust aside in 1848, to make room for one hero born of that war, and in 1852 hardly allowed to enter his name as a competitor against another. In 1852, see, also, General Pierce, who had about as much to do with the Mexican victories as little Iulus had to do with the Trojan war, yet plucking the nomination from Cass, Buchanan, Marcy, Douglas, and all the rest. The camp triumphs over cabinet and Senate. The *cedant arma togæ* is read backwards. How many of these warriors will remain in 1856 and 1860, to shoulder aside the civilians for the third and fourth time, because they were false to their duty in waging or in tolerating that war, remains to be seen. But what a righteous retribution for those civilians who, at first, might have prevented, or afterwards might have stayed, that effusion of human blood! As a specimen of poetic justice, romance or drama has nothing finer."—*Advocate of Peace.*

## WHO IS GAINING GROUND?

THOSE who maintain that the world is now governed by a perfected reason, or that reason, at least, exercises an increasing influence over any extent of domain, should survey the map of the world by the light of the daily papers, and be rebuked. The survey will disclose enormous movements going on with unprecedented rapidity, both bodily, in the shape of multitudes, and politically, in the shape of changes. If they cast their eyes towards the great divisions of the colonial world, they will see migrations and revolutions in every quarter. America is receiving yearly from England hundreds of thousands, mostly to the republic and the British provinces in the North; at the same time, a tide of emigration continues from England to Australia, with contingents, also increasing, from America. The gold discoveries are the premium which is peopling that distant land. At the same also, he will observe thousands upon thousands of Chinese departing for California—many thousands in a year, with every prospect that the stream will continue to increase. The people who are engaged in this external migration are, for the most part, not of the educated classes, but the reverse; they carry with them, for the most part, not the arts of civilization, but the habits of the uneducated multitudes; and to that extent they are peopling regions hitherto barren or scantily-peopled with communities much below the highest standard of European culture. It is true that with regard to the emigration from Europe and from America, however uneducated the multitudes may be, they have habits suitable to the reception of knowledge and of intercourse with the educated classes which accompany or follow them; but it is still the fact, that the multitudes, thrown into the new countries, are not of the high European stamp.

On the other hand, the great revolutions which are moving the political world in both hemispheres, East and West, are likewise under the sway of influences far from belonging to the highest in the range of civilization. As the *Times* expounded on Wednesday, the American continent is divided between the energetic Anglo-Saxon family, bent on spreading itself over the whole continent, and that mongrel horde of republics in which the Spanish and Portuguese elements form so large a share; republics unable to maintain their own institutions, and destined most likely to receive the yoke of a conquering foreigner, or to undergo the beatific fate of absorption into the Anglo-Saxon republic But in this process of absorption European interests become involved. In Cuba, Spain and American appear as litigants for possession—feeble old Spain shaking on her native throne, and strong young America, which is shaking States throughout that Hemisphere. But if Cuba be absorbed, what of the other Western Indies? The active men who are thus engaged in advancing the frontiers of the American Republic, do possess a very large share of education and of intellectual activity; still their enterprise partakes in a very small degree of those peaceful movements which science and commerce arrogate peculiarly to themselves. Science and commerce have a very small share in the process; and it is rather by accident that they go along with the conquering race than by design. On the older continent of Europe there is the same insurrection of unintellectual force to over-run countries superior in many respects to their despotic rulers. In political intelligence Austria cannot vie with Hungary, any more than in arts she can vie with Italy; and semi-barbarous Russia is the patron even of Austria; yet the armies of these two give laws to the greater part of Europe.

While France is conquering Kabylia, her elder possession, Corsica, is disclosed in the latest accounts as remaining under a mediæval barbarism wholly uncorrected by annexation to the capital of civilization; and France herself, which claimed to give laws not only to Algerines, but to Europe at large, is now accepting the code enforced upon it by Napoleon the Third.

Who is Napoleon the Third? He is a gentleman who has undergone a variety of changes in his style of title. Well known in the West end of London as an adventurer with small means, and the name of Bonaparte, he appeared, after numerous and various accidents, as the elected President Bonaparte of the French Republic. L. N. Bonaparte he signed himself sometimes, modestly; then he appeared as Louis Napoleon Bonaparte; then, as the Prince President, elected for ten years; and now he is hailed by anticipation and by the peasantry of Southern France, as Napoleon the Third. Historians of England reckon the reign of Charles the Second to begin with the death of Charles the First, ignoring the Commonwealth. Historians of France reckon in the line of kings that unhappy lad who died an outcast, and who is called in these histories Louis the XVII. The present historians of France reckon between the Napoleon elect and the original Napoleon, that young son who died a pensioner of Austria; and by favour of that second Napoleon, the present or future is called the Third. The historical refinement implied in that use of the auxiliary number is supposed to indicate that the voice of the peasantry is a suggested cry: but the inference is not necessary. The peasants have no doubt been familiar with the portraits of young Napoleon the Second, his father watching him from heaven; and hence the idea of a Napoleonic line is more a matter of course with that peasantry, than it is with the watchful politicians of London or Paris. Napoleon the Third is probably accepted by a large proportion of the uneducated Frenchmen, and by their help he is carrying on the peripatetic theatricals which have been well developed in the South.

The scenic effects got up are remarkable. Such, for example, as the impromptu interview with a parish priest at Bourges, in his hundredth year. The Cure pleaded for the return of three parishioners banished to Algeria, and the President all but promised compliance. By the help of the power thus obtained through the concurrence of the working classes, with the support of the whole semi-barbarous peasantry, Louis Napoleon is carrying on the process of disarming the French people. The Prefect of the police has issued circulars, requiring that the possessors of arms should deliver them up forthwith, the circular specifically applying to a great number of persons who have retained fire-arms in their dwellings, which they regard as their legitimate property, "either because they have purchased them, or because they have been accustomed to possess them as property." "*La propriété*," says the newest ally of Napoleon, Proudhon, "*c'est le vol.*" To retain arms by right of "purchase," or long possession, is an offence, in the French police law; to snatch them away is the principle of property. The *naiveté* of this circular is amusing, but what we are noting is the fact, that this adventurer, backed by the more uneducated classes, and by an immense army, is openly subduing the more intelligent and cultivated classes of France; those classes which have given to France her character for intellect, science, and art. Under the control of the inferior classes, the physical, or non-intellectual, is making inroads over the whole world. The two exceptions which we note are these:

The first is republican America, which, by favour of its new aggressive policy, is asserting itself over an extended domain, and is so far carrying a superior intelligence to overcome an inferior intelligence.

The second exception consists in the constitutional part of Europe, mainly England, which retains a position of precarious neutrality, menaced by the semi-barbarous invasion which it fears rather than defies.—*London Leader.*

PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE — UNWORTHY COMPLAINTS BY LITERARY MEN.—The two works before us are written by men who have taken to literature as a profession, who have held honourable and respectable and responsible positions as editors of high-class periodicals and influential newspapers, and who, from certain circumstances, either of a personal kind, or connected with the pursuit of literature, have been left in a much worse position in their old age than that from which they started upon a race in which it is scarcely necessary to say there are both pleasures and prizes for many. If the autobiographies before us have been faithfully written, it is greatly to be deplored that the happiness and the worldly prospects of so many must be sacrificed to the increasing demand for knowledge, and the growing taste for literature. It will scarcely, we think, be doubted that the change which has taken place in the production of books, and the diffusion of knowledge, by whatever medium, within the last half century, has been attended with many beneficial effects to mankind in general. It is quite clear that those who cultivate a taste for letters—who make their literary pursuits the mere occupation of leisure hours—could neither have originated that demand, nor met it with an adequate supply. Are we, then, to conclude that those who, feeling that they were competent to do so, have made it their vocation, must be regarded as having sacrificed themselves for the good of mankind? Few will forget the opinion which Scott gave in the form of an advice; that literature may be both pleasant and useful as a staff, but is, after all, a sorry crutch. This is a favourite theory with many professional literary men, and especially with those who condescend to be confidential to the public in recording their experiences. It forms the conclusion of all the *jeremiades* about neglect, starvation, unappreciated efforts, and misery; all the charges of heartlessness and dulness which are brought against the world by those who have not succeeded in making fortunes by their labours. Now, we have always been very much disposed to question the correctness of the great novelist's figure, so far, at least, as its general application is concerned. The opinion which it contained was not, or ought not to have been, founded on his experience; for who will be bold enough to say that Walter Scott, the advocate, or clerk of session, could either have built a princely mansion such as that which the author of "Waverly" reared by the waters of his own romantic river, or lived in it with the freedom of an ancient border chief and the expensive tastes of a modern baronet? If literature was a sorry crutch to him, it only became so when he sought to make it something more, and it certainly was strong enough to bear him up bravely and nobly so long as he kept on the path upon which he set out. His difficulties were never the result of his literary avocations, but were greatly modified by his reliance upon these avocations. And when the disastrous effects of his ambition to be something more than that which was his glory, and of commercial speculation combined, came upon him, it was neither the thought of failure in his true career, nor the feeling that his efforts had been unappreciated, that troubled him, but the reflection "how could I tread my halls with diminished crest?"

Mr. Jerdan began his career in circumstances by no means so favourable as those of Mr. Gillies, and he attained a much higher position as a man of letters. Energy, and abilities considerably above the average of men in his sphere, enabled him to ascend rapidly from a merchant's desk in London, and a lawyer's office in Edinburgh, to honourable and responsible situations in connection with the metropolitan press. In 1813, while he was only in his thirty-first year, he was appointed editor of the *Sun* when that paper was regarded as an able organ of the Government; and in four years after he became responsible editor of the *Literary Gazette*, a position which he held until 1850. According to his own statements, his connection with literature could not be unprofitable. During his editorship of one of